

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 24, 1993

The House met at 9:30 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give us, O gracious God, a broader experience of the meaning of service. Help us to realize that every situation in life presents opportunities for us to assist others in their cares or concerns. You have called us, O God, to express our humanity by helping and healing the afflictions of the day and by strengthening the bonds of respect that make us Your people. We pray that we will be faithful in the tasks You have given us now and evermore. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KIM led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that it will limit 1-minute requests to 15 requests on each side.

## FAILURE OF REPUBLICAN PLAN IS A VICTORY FOR AMERICA'S PEOPLE

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, last night the vast majority of Americans won a great victory when a Republican economic plan to protect the privileged failed.

The Republican plan would have continued the inequities of the past 12 years. It would have shielded the wealthy from doing their fair share to reduce the deficit and create jobs. It would have placed that burden squarely on the shoulders of the middle class, our children, and the elderly.

In short, the Republican plan was business as usual—protecting the privileged while offering vague caps and freezes to cut the budget and get the Nation back on track.

In contrast to the Republican plan, President Clinton has offered a real change. His plan reduces the deficit by \$500 billion. President Clinton's plan fairly distributes the burden of deficit reduction and makes specific cuts to secure a productive future for America's working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, last night's Republican failure was a great victory for the American people.

## IT JUST AIN'T SO, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. KIM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, the President has been making the rounds of the various radio talk shows talking about his budget bill. What he has been saying has not been altogether accurate.

The President maintains that his spending cuts match his tax increases dollar for dollar. Wrong. Wrong. Wrong. The fact is that he raises taxes \$3.18 for every dollar in spending cuts.

He counts as spending cuts \$44 billion mandated by the budget agreement of 1990.

He counts as spending cuts \$55 billion in anticipated reductions in interest payments.

He counts as spending cuts \$15 billion in user fees.

He counts as spending cuts \$70 billion in discretionary spending reductions which may or may not come later.

But one thing is certain in this smoke and mirrors budget, Mr. Speaker: Taxes, lots of taxes; \$250 billion in brand new taxes.

## CALLING FOR REVERSAL OF VOTE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE DEPARTMENT FEATHERBEDDING

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an unconscionable vote in the Committee on Appropriations forced millions of dollars on District taxpayers to maintain one of the worst cases of fire department featherbedding in the country. Today the District dispatches double the national average of personnel to fires. Even with the

planned reductions we will remain far ahead of the national average.

This vote, opposed by Committee on Appropriations leadership, was mandated not by safety but by the International Fire Fighters Association, whose special interest greed knows no bounds. These firefighters live in southern Maryland and Virginia but make their living in the District. They have helped force on the District a congressional exemption from commuter taxes while demanding wholly unnecessary staffing from a tax base to which they make no contribution.

Worse, this vote comes when Congress reads daily that the District's deficit has left it unable to meet its minimal obligations, and thousands of vital employees are being laid off. How much must one struggling city be forced to take? How much unprincipled interference with home rule can Congress justify? To retrieve its own self-respect and afford respect for democracy at the Capitol's doorstep, this decision must be reversed.

## PUTTING TAXES FIRST

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going through a time where we are seeing a lot of charts and graphs and we are hearing a lot of statistics, and we are talking about tax packages that are passed in the Senate, and reconciliation bills that are going to be in conference.

However, the American people should not be fooled, Mr. Speaker. When it really comes down to it, we are talking about raising people's taxes. We hear rhetoric on the other side of the aisle that we as Republicans just want to protect those people over \$200,000. I will tell the Members, that is poppycock, because when we are back in the town meetings and we are talking to real people day in and day out, they know that the taxes on gasoline or Btu taxes or whatever is going to come down in that formula are going to be taxes on real people.

Mr. Speaker, statistics can be used any way by almost anybody, but one thing cannot be denied. The President plans the largest tax increase in history. Those taxes will start hitting the middle class by the beginning of next month, and before any spending cuts are even considered. There are more taxes by a quantity of three, if we look

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

at the Senate bill, or by a quantity of six, if we look at the House bill, than there are spending cuts. This is what the American people are most concerned about.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO CHAIRMAN WILLIAM NATCHER

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it was earlier this week when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the dean of our delegation, was honored for having cast 18,000 consecutive votes here in the House of Representatives. It is a record not only for this body, which will live forever, but for any parliamentary body in the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I, as a member of the Kentucky delegation for over 20 years, have been happy to walk in the shadows of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], because he is exemplary not only as a legislator but as a human being and as a lawmaking leader. It is also a tribute to him, despite the pressures on him and the long days, that by the end of our work week next week, Mr. Speaker, we will have completed our work on, I believe, all of the appropriations bills which run Government.

Once again, not only is the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], my dean and friend, carving a record that will never be excelled in the history of this planet, but, even as he is doing that, he is continuing the hard, mundane, but very important work of this House. Again, it is a pleasure to extend congratulations to Chairman NATCHER, and to tell him how much of a pleasure it is to have him as our leader in this House of Representatives.

#### TAX PROPOSAL

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be nice if Congress could learn from its mistakes. Instead the Democrats offered the same so-called deficit reduction plan that didn't work in 1990. I don't know about anyone else, but if I grab a hot pan and get burned I certainly would not grab it again, with the same rhetoric of 1990.

In 1990, the gasoline tax was raised 5 cents per gallon, in 1993 it will be raised 5 cents again. In 1990, income taxes were raised and in 1993, income taxes will be raised again.

Recently, a restaurant owner wrote to USA Today saying he had already planned who to lay off due to the President's plan. He is planning for higher energy taxes, higher taxes on small business, more Federal regulations, a health care payroll tax for the Presi-

dent's new socialized medicine scheme, and the list goes on and on.

Does this sound like an economy boosting plan? Working people, watch out—you are about to get burned again.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PLAN THE ONLY GAME IN TOWN

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Senate we saw a clean loss for the Republicans, but a huge win for the American people. The Republican alternative to the President's reconciliation package went down in flames because it did not offer any substance, just more smoke and mirrors.

Once again it is clear President Clinton's plan is the only game in town.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics are relevant: 78.2 percent of the tax burden in the President's plan is borne by those that make over \$200,000, the privileged. The privileged are paying more than their fair share.

The Republican plan once again shows its true colors and exempts totally those who make over \$200,000.

Mr. Speaker, the President's plan is the only game in town. It is a serious deficit-reduction effort. It will get us toward more positive roads to economic recovery.

Once again, the Republicans have shown that they like to tax everyone except the rich.

#### CUTTING THROUGH THE CLAIMS AND COUNTERCLAIMS

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the rest of my colleagues, but I am getting kind of tired of smoke and mirrors. We are talking about the same thing, but you would never recognize it when everyone gets up here to talk.

Can Members imagine what someone out at home in Greybull, WY, is thinking about what we are doing with taxes?

Let me read just a little bit from the New York Times, which is not exactly a conservative chronicle, but I think they intend to really deal with it.

It says:

The ratio of tax increases to spending cuts. The Democrats say their package is evenly divided between the two. Republicans say the Democrats are more interested in raising taxes, and contend that the spending reductions may never come to pass.

In fact, the higher-income taxes would go into effect this year, and most of the other taxes would become effective in January. But most of the spending cuts would come much later.

Spending will be lowered this year and only 7 percent of reductions will take place in the next fiscal year. More than three-fifths of the spending cuts, \$165 billion out of \$267 billion, will take place in fiscal years 1997 and 1998, after the end of the presidential term.

That gives Members some idea of where we are when we talk about the facts.

#### CUT SPENDING FIRST ACT OF 1993

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, again and again, I have heard from my constituents about the need to cut spending first. If we are to eliminate the catastrophic deficit that is eating away at our future, and if we are going to run the Government more like a business, we must cut out programs that can no longer be justified.

That is why I voted for the line-item veto. That is why I voted for the budget reconciliation package that had over 200 individual spending cuts. And that is why today I am introducing the Cut Spending First Act of 1993, which has a baker's dozen of individual spending program eliminations that will save our Nation over \$21 billion during the next 5 years.

Among the programs to be eliminated in my bill are huge, ill-conceived projects like the superconducting super collider and farm programs that benefit only a privileged few like the honey price support program. Beyond canceling the super collider and the honey program, this bill will:

Cancel NASA advanced solid rocket motor program.

Eliminate the market protection program which subsidizes foreign advertising of agriculture products.

Eliminate the tobacco price support program.

Eliminate the World War II-era price supports for wool and mohair.

Eliminate the peanut price support program.

Institute mining royalties on Federal land.

Increase grazing fees on Federal land to market rates, which was part of the original Clinton economic package, but was eliminated due to lobbying pressure.

Increase below-cost timber sales on Federal lands to market rates.

End the Federal Crop Insurance Program.

Make our NATO and Far East allies pay 75 percent of the labor costs for U.S. bases in their nations.

Big and small, every program in the budget needs to be scrutinized and justified. If it cannot pass muster, we should eliminate it.

I firmly believe that we will never grow our economy and allow the pri-



vate sector to retain and build high-skill, high-wage jobs until we get our deficit under control. I urge this Congress to adopt the proposals in the Cut Spending First Act so that we can build the economy instead of the Government.

#### MORE RHETORIC ABOUT CUTTING THE DEFICIT

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, once again we hear the wonderful rhetoric about how the President's proposed tax increases are going to reduce the deficit. If this were not so serious it would be laughable. It is ludicrous.

Last week in Japan the Prime Minister lost a vote of confidence because he could not deliver on political reform. And even the liberal Washington Post said, "Every politician here," meaning Japan, "supports political reform, verbally, at least as much as American politicians say they support cutting the deficit."

That is what we are doing. We are saying we support cutting the deficit by hiking the taxes immediately and by promising future spending cuts.

We have tried this approach before in 1982, in 1984, in 1987, in 1989 and in 1990. We got every dime of the promised tax increase and not a penny of the promised future spending reductions.

Here we are in 1993 ready to go through the same charade once again.

Mr. Speaker, the President's economic plan may fool people inside the beltway, but the American people are not fooled. They know a tax increase when they see it. They know empty rhetoric when they hear it.

It is a formula for failure, a tragedy for America, and I just pray that we can quickly turn this situation around.

#### CANCEL THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks several Members have offered minor amendments for deficit reduction which I have supported. I urge Members today to cast their votes on significant deficit reduction.

A lot of people talk a good game about cutting spending. Enough of nickel and dime cuts. Make the cuts that will make a difference.

Today we have an opportunity to save taxpayers in this Chamber over \$8 billion. The real issue is whether we can afford the superconducting super collider. Taxpayers have already spent \$1.6 billion on what was originally esti-

mated by the Department of Energy to be a \$4 billion project. Since the super collider was first proposed to Congress in 1987, costs have nearly tripled to more than \$11 billion.

Canceling the super collider will save American taxpayers \$8.7 billion, money that can go toward debt retirement.

Earlier this month, the voters of Texas voted resoundingly to slash Federal spending. Let the real cuts begin.

#### MOVE FORWARD WITH COLLINS IMPEACHMENT

(Mr. CANADY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call on the House to act quickly to impeach U.S. District Judge Robert F. Collins of the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The disgrace of a convicted bribe-taker drawing paychecks from the taxpayers has continued long enough.

One month ago I introduced a resolution calling for Judge Collins' impeachment.

And this week the Judicial Conference of the United States certified to the Speaker that "the impeachment of Judge Collins may be warranted."

The fact is that Judge Collins has been found guilty of taking a bribe from a convicted drug smuggler.

He exhausted his last appeal more than 2 months ago.

Yet he continues to draw his salary as a Federal judge.

And he could eventually retire on full salary unless we in the House impeach him.

It is essential that the House carry out its responsibility under article 1, section 2 of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the House should move forward with impeachment proceedings against Judge Collins without further delay.

#### NINETEEN COUNTRIES DUMP STEEL IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, secret documents prove that 19 foreign countries conspired to dump steel in America. Twelve of those countries also subsidize their steel industry. The countries include Japan and Germany. Does that ring a bell? We provide \$100 billion a year for the defense of those countries.

It also includes Canada and Mexico, you know, North American free trade? How about North American ripoff.

And guess what? We have given the ITC 45 days to see if this dumping all these years has hurt the American steel industry. Beam me up. We have gone from boom towns to ghost towns

rusting away, thousands of families lost their homes, lost their jobs, and we are going to study it.

To all you free traders, let me say this: Free trade has to be a two-way street. It is time to hit these countries in their pocketbook for ripping us off. Nothing less will work.

□ 0950

#### HIV BAN LIFTED

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States denies permanent immigration status to individuals with communicable diseases of public health significance. Examples of this include syphilis, leprosy, and infectious tuberculosis. Recently, as a body, 356 Members voted to extend this immigration ban to HIV-infected individuals. The President signed legislation codifying this ban on HIV-infected immigration.

Recently, a Federal judge effectively ruled that we have no jurisdiction over who enters our borders and ordered that the HIV/AIDS-infected Haitians in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, be released from there and taken to the United States. This ruling is another attempt to give a disease civil rights protection at the expense of the American taxpayer. The Clinton administration has said it will abide by the decision of this Federal judge.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be a dangerous precedent to set. Why is the President showing such a low regard for the views of the Members of the House by not defending the law which had such bipartisan support on the Hill?

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to ask the President to fulfill his duty as the Chief Executive of the laws of the land by fighting this unconstitutional ruling of a lower court judge. The American people deserve to be protected from the expense and possible health risk which this judge's order tries to enforce.

#### THE ASPIN COMPROMISE

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we are now hearing the first reports from the Pentagon's recommendations for gays and lesbians in the military.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to "don't ask/don't tell": Don't ask us to support it. Don't tell us that it's fair.

The Pentagon proposal says being gay is incompatible with military service.

This proposal is incompatible with the Bill of Rights.

This plan would prohibit gays from declaring in any way they were gay and would prohibit any homosexual conduct on or off base.

How does the Pentagon plan to enforce a prohibition on private speech? Would this not be a flagrant violation of the first amendment?

I oppose the ban. I want it lifted completely.

Let the military get on with its real job—defending the rights of citizens, not taking their rights away.

#### DO NOT REPEAL THE HYDE AMENDMENT

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for the last 16 years, the Hyde amendment has prevented Federal Medicaid tax dollars from funding most abortions. For the first time in those 16 years, it is in serious danger of being repealed.

I strongly support the Hyde amendment, and I honestly believe that if the Clinton administration is successful in its efforts to repeal the Hyde amendment, we will see a dramatic increase in the number of abortions in this country.

Additionally, States will lose the flexibility they currently have to limit their own tax dollars from being spent on abortions and, finally, and perhaps most disturbing of all, the door will be open to make abortion on demand a part of the new national health care plan.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is wrong to force American taxpayers to pay for abortions. President Clinton said he would like to see fewer abortions. I fear that if the Hyde amendment is repealed, we will see quite the opposite. The number of abortions will grow, and tragically those taxpayers most opposed to abortion will be forced to pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is not right.

#### THE NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST PROGRAM

(Mr. MCHALE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Robert Kennedy spoke to the best of our national character when he said:

Let no one be discouraged by the belief that there is nothing one man or one woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ill—against misery and ignorance, injustice and violence \* \* \*. Few will have the greatness to bend history itself; but each of us can work to change a small portion of events and in the total of all those acts will be written the history of this generation.

When the House considers H.R. 2010, President Clinton's National Service

Trust Program, we will have an important opportunity to breathe new life into that historic ideal of public service. This legislation would allow a student to earn up to \$10,000 in educational assistance by spending 1 or 2 years working in a full-time commitment to improve our country—providing shelter for the homeless, teaching in tough urban schools, expanding child care, conserving our natural resources, establishing elder-care, and most important, restoring a sense of national community and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support President Clinton's National Service Trust Program, as we remind ourselves and our country that a healthy democracy requires not only a recognition of rights but a willing individual acceptance of responsibilities. That is what Bobby Kennedy taught all of us a quarter century ago.

#### INTEGRITY OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM THREATENED

(Mr. LAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of a serious threat to the integrity of the Federal Civil Service System.

The Legis Fellows Program, operated by the Federal Office of Personnel Management since its inception in 1979, is perhaps the premier program run by the Federal Government for the professional development of promising middle managers. It has always been operated in a bipartisan manner and run with the utmost professionalism.

I have learned and I have confirmed that the Department of Health and Human Services has told its newest participants in the Legis Program that they may not take assignments in Republican offices on Capitol Hill. These employees may only work in Democratic offices.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing less than outrageous. It is wrong to politicize the civil service. The public demands and has every right to expect a civil service system operated without political interference, free of partisan manipulation.

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that I have sent a letter to Secretary Shalala and to the chairman and ranking Republican of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee asking for an investigation of this matter.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION BANNING ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF MEMBERS OF TERRORIST GROUPS

(Mr. DEUTSCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remark.)

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 1 a.m., six terrorists were arrested in New York. They were arrested for plotting to kill Senator D'AMATO, to kill an assemblyman in New York, to kill the U.N. Secretary, to blow up the Holland Tunnel.

About 2 months ago, Senator D'AMATO of New York and I introduced legislation to ban any member of the terrorist group Hamas from entering this country. Hamas members are able to operate in this country. The FBI has publicly reported instances of them doing fundraising. Their spokesman has testified or spoken out of northern Virginia.

Unfortunately, in this country we have gotten to the point where terrorism is within our shores. We must take strong action. We must ban any terrorists or members of terrorist organizations from entering our shores at any time under any circumstances.

I urge the support of that bill and urge the Members of this Congress and the entire country to support that legislation, to be aware of those things that we need to do to prevent this terrorist-type activity.

#### TAX PLAN HURTS SMALL BUSINESS

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, when they took over the White House, the Democrats said they were going to get America moving again. We thought they meant forward.

They have now put into place one of the most deadly tax plans in the history of this country. A number of speakers this morning have talked about the Democrats taxing the privileged. Well, many of those so-called privileged are small business people. They employ people.

Most of the growth in our jobs comes from small business. When a small businessman has greater taxes, he is not going to expand his institution, his factory, his facility. He is not going to buy that extra piece of equipment, and, most importantly, he is not going to hire those extra workers.

Mr. Speaker, this perpetuates the Democrat philosophy that somehow if you burn down the factory you help the workers.

#### THE COMPETING BUDGET PLANS

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me at the interpretations that the Republicans will



try to play or put on things that are so obvious.

The previous speaker just talked about how the Democrats want to make small business pay more in taxes.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, when we presented the plan to this body, we wanted to have \$25,000 in expensing for small business. The Republican plan from the Senate lowered that, cut into what we were trying to do for small business, brought it back down from \$25,000. That is just a fact. That is just how it is.

You see, there is a fundamental difference in this country between Democrats and Republicans. There is a fundamental difference in this country about the way we view the world, Republicans and Democrats.

In the 1980's the Republicans allowed the rich in this country to get away without paying their taxes, and we, as Democrats in society, have decided that we are not going to do that. That is why we are having this problem with the Republicans today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to again point out the fundamental difference between who Democrats have asked to bear the burden of the budget bill and who the Republicans have asked to bear that burden.

The President and the Democratic Members of Congress have shaped a budget that asks the wealthiest in this country to pay their fair share.

Republicans hollered that it was all so unfair. In response, they attempted to place the burden on the backs of those who paid in the 1980's.

In the Republican view of the world, the poor have not paid enough, the elderly have more to give, and family farmers and small businesses can take another hit. But the rich have been tapped dry. It would be unfair, in the Republican view of things, to ask them to pay more—to pay their fair share.

□ 1000

#### SPENDING CUT LITE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton is trying to convince the American people that he wants to cut spending as he raises the largest tax increase in history.

But his budget is more like spending cut lite: It makes less cuts than the Republican alternative, but it tastes great to the American people—or so the President thinks.

Only 30 percent of the President's spending cuts are real. The rest are either already approved, promised in the future, user fees or interest savings.

In fact, of the President's budget package, as passed by the other body, 72 percent is made up of new taxes, while only 24 percent in spending cuts. That is a 3-to-1 ratio.

The President thinks spending cut lite is just what the American people want. I think, however, that this tax-heavy package will leave a bitter taste in mouths of most Americans.

#### CUT THE SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. KREIDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider an amendment from Mr. SLATTERY and Mr. BOEHLERT to cut funding for the superconducting super collider. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

First, we just cannot afford this project.

How can we cut billions of dollars from critical programs for children and the elderly, ask our middle class to share responsibility for deficit reduction, and then turn around and spend \$12 billion on a science project?

I cannot tell my constituents that their very real benefits must be cut to pay for some merely possible benefits years down the road.

Second, this project is a classic funding black hole.

The General Accounting Office found that the project is already 51 percent over budget on construction alone.

The Department of Energy's Inspector General recently found that almost \$400 million already has been mismanaged.

Finally, if we are serious about deficit reduction, we have to make tough choices. That means putting parochial interests aside and tackling the deficit problem head-on. This is where the buck stops. Here and now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Slattery/Boehlert amendment.

#### DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN SEEN AS FAIR AND BALANCED

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, the news is that 78.5 percent of the revenue generated in the Clinton economic plan will be paid by the super wealthy in this country—those making over \$200,000 a year.

USA Today, in a front page story, said it best:

Parties clash on who'll pay the budget bill tab. Democrats say the rich; Republicans say elderly, middle class will get stuck.

The Senate Republican plan was a fiasco—aimed at protecting, once again, the super wealthy. The Democrats have wisely shot it down.

The Democratic plan has more deficit reduction than any other alternative offered. For every one dollar in

revenue there is a companion dollar in spending cuts.

The Democratic plan is fair and embraces the national interest while rejecting a protection plan for the wealthy and special interests.

Mr. Speaker, this week the stakes are high, but rest assured the burden on the middle class and our senior citizens will be low. The super wealthy will now have to shoulder their responsibility.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1004

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2445, with Mr. HUGHES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 23, 1993, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, no amendment affecting the subject of the superconducting super collider is in order except the one offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], or his designee, which shall be debatable for 1 hour and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2445

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, for energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

##### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to

river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, \$207,540,000, to remain available until expended, of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Central Basin Groundwater Project, California, \$750,000;  
Los Angeles County Water Conservation, California, \$100,000;  
Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, California, \$300,000;  
Norco Bluffs, California, \$150,000;  
Rancho Palos Verdes, California, \$80,000;  
Biscayne Bay, Florida, \$700,000;  
Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida, \$250,000;  
Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana, \$4,000,000;  
Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, \$200,000;  
Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, \$310,000;  
Ohio River Shoreline Flood Protection, Indiana, \$400,000;  
Hazard, Kentucky, \$250,000;  
Brockton, Massachusetts, \$350,000;  
Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey, \$17,000,000;  
Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania, \$400,000;  
Juniata River Basin, Pennsylvania, \$450,000;  
Lackawanna River Basin Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, \$300,000;  
Pocotaligo River and Swamp, South Carolina, \$400,000;  
Jennings Randolph Lake, West Virginia, \$400,000;  
Monongahela River Comprehensive, West Virginia, \$600,000; and  
West Virginia Comprehensive, West Virginia, \$500,000.

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), \$1,389,138,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, for one-half of the costs of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects, including rehabilitation costs for the Lock and Dam 25, Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri, and GIWW-Brazos River Floodgates, Texas, projects, and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Rillito River, Arizona, \$4,200,000;  
Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas, \$3,500,000;  
Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California, \$4,000,000;  
Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California, \$400,000;  
San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, \$12,000,000;  
Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration Project, California, \$4,000,000;  
Central and Southern Florida, Florida, \$17,850,000;  
Kissimmee River, Florida, \$5,000,000;  
Melaleuca Quarantine Facility, Florida, \$1,000,000;

Casino Beach, Illinois, \$820,000;  
McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois, \$13,000,000;  
O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, \$5,000,000;  
Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, \$2,700,000;  
Barbourville (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$3,868,000;  
Harlan (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$15,432,000;  
Pike County (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$5,000,000;  
Salyersville, Kentucky, \$1,000,000;  
Williamsburg (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, \$700,000;  
Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, \$24,119,000;  
Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Jefferson Parish), Louisiana, \$200,000;  
Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, \$65,000,000;  
Anacostia River, Maryland and District of Columbia, \$700,000;  
Clinton River Spillway, Michigan, \$2,000,000;  
Silver Bay Harbor, Minnesota, \$2,600,000;  
Stillwater, Minnesota, \$2,400,000;  
Sowashee Creek, Mississippi, \$3,240,000;  
Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey, \$1,000,000;  
New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York and New Jersey, \$3,900,000;  
Rochester Harbor, New York, \$4,000,000;  
Wilmington Harbor Ocean Bar, North Carolina, \$5,266,000;  
West Columbus, Ohio, \$5,000,000;  
Lackawanna River Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, \$2,000,000;  
South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, Pennsylvania, \$10,000,000;  
Fort Point, Galveston, Texas, \$1,500,000;  
Lake O' The Pines—Big Cypress Bayou, Texas, \$300,000;  
Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, \$4,000,000;  
Wallisville Lake, Texas, \$1,000,000;  
Richmond Filtration Plant, Virginia, \$1,000,000;  
Southern West Virginia Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, West Virginia, \$3,500,000; and  
State Road and Ebner Coulees, LaCrosse and Shelby, Wisconsin, \$1,467,000.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN: Page 4, line 16, strike "\$1,389,138,000" and insert "\$1,384,138,000".

Page 5, strike line 14.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike the \$5 million presently in this bill for the Kissimmee River restoration project. The last Army Corps of Engineers estimate for the total cost of this project is \$745.5 million.

The Palm Beach Post on April 11 of this year estimated that it may take \$2 billion over the next 15 years to complete this project. The 200,000 member National Taxpayers Union has voted this as the No. 1 boondoggle—the most wasteful project—in this Congress.

This project is also opposed by the 85,000 member Florida Farm Bureau, which felt strongly enough about it to come to Washington to testify against it.

It was also opposed by unanimous votes of the three most-affected county commissions—Highlands, Glades, and Okeechobee Counties. According to the Army Corps of Engineers feasibility study, 356 homes will be lost, along with 5 farms, and 38 buildings. All this to put curves back in a river on which the corps spent \$30 million to straighten out between 1961 and 1970.

This project was featured by ABC News a few months ago in a series they are doing on wasteful government spending. The project has also been written about critically in *Insight* magazine and Jack Anderson's syndicated column. A university economics professor, in a study of this project, has estimated that it will eventually cause the loss of 38,500 jobs.

This is being done primarily to keep from interfering with the migratory patterns of the coot, the blue-winged teal, and the ring-tailed duck, none of which is endangered. We are starting down a slippery slope towards some very great costs in the years ahead if we do not stop this project now. If the project is really needed, then let the State of Florida pay for it. They are in much better shape financially than is our Federal Government.

I respectfully request a "yes" vote on my motion to strike.

□ 1010

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to take a second to say that I strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

I think the primary reason for doing this is because of the simple fact that the country is going broke, and very quickly. We are spending about 58 cents out of every personal tax dollar now on interest alone on the national debt. If this truly is a conservation project, and the gentleman mentioned the species that are to be conserved, I think we must first conserve our children and our grandchildren and their ability to enjoy the Kissimmee River and other projects like it is going to be greatly mitigated and reduced by the enormous debt that we are placing on their shoulders with increased Federal spending.

Even the Clinton plan increases spending dramatically in the next several years.

So Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman on his amendment. The species that he mentioned that are to be saved or to be supported by the Kissimmee River project, I know at least that two of them, the blue-winged teal and the American coot are legal game and hunters bag literally hundreds of thousands of them each year across the



length and breadth of the United States in duck blinds every year; so they are not endangered and we do not need to spend \$745 million to propagate those species.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for those very appropriate comments.

I might mention that this project is going to destroy three valuable fishing areas as well if it is carried out.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee brought this to my attention and I think he does this country a real service by focusing attention on this project.

Between 1961 and 1971, our Government spent \$30 million to take the curves out of this river.

Now, think about that. We spent \$30 million to take the curves out of this river because they said that is what we should do.

Now they want to spend \$745 million to put the curves back in the river.

Now, think about that. They spent \$30 million to take the curves out of the river and they said, "Oh, my gosh, we make a mistake. Now we have to spend \$745 million to put the curves back in the river."

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, the American people have got to be crying in their beer. They certainly are not going to laugh at this. This is absolutely insane.

Why would we do what the Army Corps of Engineers wanted to do from 1961 to 1971 and then come back and spend 12 or 13 times as much trying to put the curves back in the river?

This boondoggle should not be approved by this body, and the \$5 million that is in here to study this should be removed.

This boondoggle has been exposed by ABC World News Tonight with Peter Jennings in the Euro money segment. Jack Anderson did a national column on this boondoggle. The Washington Times Insight Sunday magazine did. The National Taxpayers Union Newsletter and Dollars and Cents, and the letters from citizens along the river.

And who opposes this \$745 million waste? Three country commissions which border the river, Highlands, Glades, Okeechobee County Commissions, the Florida Farm Bureau, 85,000 members, the National Taxpayers Union, 200,000 members; farmers who live along the river, small business people who live along the river, grass roots citizens groups along the river, and even some environmentalists.

I can tell you, the American taxpayers are against it. They do not want to spend \$30 million 20 years ago, 15 years ago, for a project and then have it all reversed and put back the same way at a cost to them of \$745 million.

It makes no sense, Mr. Chairman. We should support the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Duncan amendment and in support of the committee's request for restoration funding.

Last year Congress confirmed its commitment to the project with the passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

Under a shared 50-50 cost agreement the State of Florida and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have initiated the necessary steps to begin restoration efforts.

The unique Kissimmee River Restoration project is indeed a tremendous environmental undertaking. The restoration project is part of an overall program to restore Florida's ecosystem and provide much-needed habitat conservation areas—which are diminishing at a dangerous rate.

Mr. Chairman, unlike Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, I represent approximately 80 percent of the restoration project.

I share the remaining 20 percent with my colleagues Congressman CANADY and Congressman BACCHUS. The majority of those constituents who the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] suggests he is protecting are mine.

I know well their concerns. In fact as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] knows, I spent all day Monday discussing one-on-one those concerns during my visit to the impacted area.

And as I have shared with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], I understand their apprehension regarding the effort. However, I believe it is the responsibility of myself and the members of the Florida delegation to ensure these doubts are eased.

And as I promised the residents of Highlands Glades and Okeechobee Counties, I will personally discuss these matters with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Florida's South Florida Water Management District.

This \$5 million is critical to the process of negotiating land acquisitions necessary to the restoration with the State of Florida.

I believe these are the same farmers, ranchers, and business people who the gentleman from Tennessee refers to in the literature distributed throughout the House.

Should the Federal Government not live up to its fiscal responsibilities and maintain the commitment to meeting its obligations, the State's pursuit of future land acquisitions could be diluted.

Needless to say, the impact of such a signal from the Federal Government could send land prices plummeting and leave numerous landowners in an unfair and unjust state of flux.

Numerous statements have been made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] regarding the project which I would like to clarify at this time.

First, the project costs prior to inflation adjustments will amount to approximately \$372 million which will be equally shared by the State of Florida and the Federal Government.

With inflation adjustments, this amount may increase to approximately \$490 million, again to be equally split between the State of Florida and the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Tennessee uses numbers from the Army Corps which inappropriately included funding levels for several locally preferred options which if implemented would be the fiscal responsibility of the State and the State only.

For the gentleman's information, I have a letter from the corps which should put this matter to rest and eliminate any further misinformation from being distributed.

In terms of flood control, I can personally assure the gentleman that his claim is inaccurate, given the fact that I authored an amendment which was approved by the House mandating that no restoration measure could be taken which would lessen the flood control levels which are currently enjoyed today.

I want to thank the gentlemen for offering his amendment today. Healthy debate on an issue of this magnitude is in my opinion a necessary process.

However, I believe the information he uses to make his point is out-of-date and not accurate.

I support the need to move ahead on this important environmental effort and assure the gentleman, given his personal interest in this Florida project, that I will keep him apprised of our progress.

However, I do not intend to support his amendment, believing it will be a significant setback to the State's environmental restoration efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

□ 1020

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that a picture is worth a thousand words, so I brought a road map of south Florida here, and I would like to go through little history of this.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], tampering with the ecosystem and the water system of south Florida, would be somewhat like me getting up here and moving to dynamite all of the dams in the Tennessee Valley Authority, because it would have the same effect on the State of Florida. I say to the gentleman, "You're really tampering with the water supply of about 6 million people in south Florida. Let me give you a little history."

This problem was created by the Federal Government when the Corps of En-

gineers decided to channel and channelize the Kissimmee River here, and what happened is a nutrient in the north part of the Kissimmee River at Orlando, it would take it about 2 years for that nutrient to meander through the Kissimmee River and hit Lake Okeechobee. Once the river was channelized, it took 3 days, so none of the nutrients from the farms on both sides of the Kissimmee River were able to leach out, and what happened to Lake Okeechobee? A new term came into our definition called "eutrophication," and the lake started dying on us, and so right now we are trying to do what God, in Her wisdom, did in the beginning, rechannelize or remeander the river so that these nutrients can leach out so Lake Okeechobee does not die like Lake Apopka just north of that.

This, my colleagues, is the water supply of all south Florida. We have the Palm Beach Canal that goes into Palm Beach County, we have the Miami Canal that goes into Dade County, we have the Caloosahatchee River which I am sure the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] will speak about which goes into the west coast, which is Lee County and Collier County, and we are dealing with millions and millions of people here.

This was created by the Federal Government. Now it is their responsibility to correct the problems there, and I strongly urge my colleagues not to get involved and to do something that would destroy this system here. This is the lifeblood of south Florida. Lake Okeechobee, in turn, drains into the Everglades, and the Everglades is dying right now. Why? Because we are not getting the proper amount of water in there. The Everglades drains into Florida Bay at the base of here. Florida Bay is dying right now, and, if my colleagues talk to any environmentalist or anybody involved with the hydro problems of south Florida, they will say that we have got to correct the system at the north, which is the origin of the Kissimmee River Valley there.

I ask my colleagues to strongly defeat this amendment. It will have great consequences on about 6 million people.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I find this a remarkable debate. It is just amazing to me, having spent 30-some million dollars to take out the curves in the river, now we are proposing to spend \$745 million to put them back in again, and I would just observe, Mr. Chairman, that this, in microcosm, is what is causing the terrible financial problems of this country.

We all, as a Congress and the executive branch, incorporate the deficit into our political discourse, and it is as if we think that simply by referencing the deficit and having a flurry of words

that we can make people feel good, and feel that we are doing something about it, but the reality is, as my colleagues know, the budget of the United States is filled with expenditures like this one.

Mr. Chairman, this one is a particularly graphic example, and I am not going to get into the details of whether this proposal is an environmentally sound idea or not. I will just observe that the county commissions of the affected areas, as I understand it, including the Okeechobee County Commission, is opposed to this idea, as are the County Commissions of Highlands and Glades. The Farm Bureau of the State of Florida, 85,000 members strong, is opposed to this idea, and other speakers have pointed out the absurdity of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to undo what was only very recently done.

What is our cumulative national debt today? It is over \$4 trillion. Under the plan being advanced by the President, being debated in the other body now, having passed out of this body, over a 5-year period using the administration's numbers, another trillion dollars in cumulative national debt will be added. It is just amazing to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Post on June 16 observed in its article on the crisis in Japan "every politician here—meaning Japan—supports political reform verbally, at least as much as American politicians say they support cutting the deficit." Clearly no one outside the beltway believes that we are serious about cutting the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, it is tragic, and here we have another example of a huge project being funded by the Congress. Why are we borrowing money, burdening our children and future generations to do things like this? Should we not first eliminate the debt, eliminate the deficit? When we have a surplus and after we have taken care of Americans struggling families, if we have money after that, maybe we can consider projects like this one. But to me, Mr. Chairman, this expenditure typifies everything that is wrong with the way this Government process works. All we do is give lip service to the idea of saving money, but the reality is that it is business as usual here in Washington.

I think this is a very worthy amendment and would urge Members to support it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concerns raised by my colleague and friend from Tennessee over the cost of the Kissimmee River restoration project, and I very much share his goal of restoring fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government and removing the waste from our budget, as several of the other opponents have talked about. But it seems to me that what might be appropriate here is to remember that

an expert is always somebody who is defined as somebody from out of town, and my colleagues are hearing some testimony from some Members of Congress who actually live in the area, who understand the issue and understand the dollars of the issue as well as the quality of life issues, and they understand we are talking about a national treasure, and I want to focus a little bit on some of that.

The restoration of the Kissimmee River and the Everglades has been properly identified as a national priority. These vital water resources that we are talking about have been subjected to a lot of planning, a lot of debate, a lot of lawsuits in the State of Florida, and I would hope that my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], would agree that Florida and its congressional delegation, as well as the Nation's leadership and those responsible for these water bodies, deserve a strong voice in deciding how best to proceed, just as, I think, Tennesseans deserve a strong voice in making decisions where Tennessee-based projects are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Government turned the Kissimmee River into a canal a lot of years ago, as we heard, and did an awful lot of damage to the Kissimmee River and the Everglades ecosystems and to the quality of life around them. We have a responsibility to act here, to fix what has been broken. The State of Florida has committed to carrying its share of the burden, and it is a giant share, much bigger than the Federal share, but Florida cannot do it alone, and in fact I must point out that, contrary to what some critics have charged, this project is mostly being supported by non-Federal—mostly Florida—resources. This is something the Federal Government broke, yet the State of Florida and other parties are ready to pick up the lion's share of fixing, and it is a project that matters not just to Florida, but to the whole Nation, if not the world. The damage is reversible, but only if we act fairly soon.

□ 1030

The project has been delayed for a long time. The Kissimmee River is an integral part of the recovery plan for the Florida Everglades. Should we fail in our efforts to revive the dying everglades, the cost to the environment, to the American taxpayer, and to the world in lost natural resources is literally incalculable.

I am sensitive to the ongoing concerns of Florida residents who are most directly impacted by the restoration, and I realize there are some problems. We have heard testimony on that from the honorable Members of this body who live there and are dealing with these problems and have them under control.

The current plan is not perfect. It is better than what we have now, and it



will be better yet. I think if we do not recognize that this is going to be a self-defeating vote on this amendment if it is supported, we are making a mistake. It will not save us 745 million Federal dollars. I repeat, it will not save \$745 million to vote for the Duncan amendment. On the contrary, this is a \$5 million Federal item in the budget this year, and Florida's share of this budget to fix it is \$500 million. That shows the degree of commitment the State of Florida has in this.

The State supports this, the water management district supports it, the Coalition of the Everglades supports it, the Audubon Society supports it. The League of Women Voters supports it, and a long list of others support this project. I suggest it is a terribly shortsighted, nonvisionary approach to cut this project right now.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a vote that will be put down as an environmental vote, it is this one.

What we are trying to do and what the committee is trying to do by putting this money into this bill is simply to say that we have to turn the clock back on the Everglades. It is important to realize that what we are talking about is the salvation of one of the Nation's greatest treasures.

Everglades itself means River of Grass. It starts up at the headwaters of the Kissimmee River, it comes south, it goes into Lake Okeechobee, and then it flows south into the Florida Bay.

It is vital that we look at what mankind has done to the Everglades, what we have done to Florida Bay, what we have done to Lake Okeechobee.

It was said by one of the previous speakers that members of the Farm Bureau are against this. This is a very hotly debated issue in the State of Florida because there are farmlands that will be flooded by this project. But what we are talking about is putting the river back to what it was, as closely as we can, and yet minimize the damage to surrounding property owners. It is a forward-looking project.

When I was a youngster, you could almost read the date on a dime on the bottom of Lake Okeechobee. Now you cannot see the bottom of the lake because it is so murky. Why is it murky? Because the runoff into the Kissimmee River, which is flowing directly, unfiltered, goes back into Lake Okeechobee.

The is the result of a project of the Army Corps of Engineers, a well-intentioned project, many, many years ago, probably predating all of us in this Chamber. We must restore it.

Then you get, after that, the damage we have done to the lake. Then it goes through more agricultural land, it picks up more nutrients and runs south, where we find the whole ecosystem of the Everglades is now chang-

ing, and where there once was sawgrass, now we find that these nutrients are bringing in all other kinds of vegetation, including cattails and other things, and that is greatly changing the ecosystem of the Everglades.

Then as it gets further south, we find the rechannelization, which is something we are going to have to be talking about later, and this does impact upon Florida Bay, where we find the turtle grass is dying and where we find that the only living reef in the United States is dying because of this runoff.

This is all because of the damage that has been done by mankind through development, through agriculture, and through engineering. We are simply saying, let us turn the clock back. Let us restore the original flow of this once great river, which was flowing in a filtered fashion into Lake Okeechobee. It is time that we do the right thing.

I can tell the Members that there has never been a project that I think is more deserving than this one. There has never been one that is more economically sound, because of the damage the present channelization is doing to the area south of it, and there is not one that has been more environmentally sound, because what we are trying to do is to restore a great natural resource.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that there has been a suit on whether or not the State of Florida has been guilty of polluting this river, and it has been going on for some time. I have been informed the State of Florida spent about \$20 million on the suit, and the Governor just recently admitted that the State of Florida has been guilty of polluting that river and that is one of the major causes of the problem. Is that correct?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, the suit the gentleman refers to is more on the south side of the lake, and it is in regard to the sugar cane grown down on the south side. That is another subject, one which has been very controversial.

This suit was brought, incidentally, by the Federal Government through the State's attorney's office. In fact, it was U.S. Attorney Latham who brought this against the State of Florida. It is trying to project exactly what we are trying to accomplish as a result.

But the lawsuit itself—and some Member from Florida can correct me if I am misstating it—but the lawsuit itself, I believe, is anchored on the south side of the lake. It has nothing to do with the project. I am sure there will be other lawsuits because there is land that is going to be flooded. But that land that would be flooded would be the land that was historically flooded.

We are not going back and doing anything to land that was never under water.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I guess what I am trying to find out is this: The pollution problems that have taken place along that river, are they part of the cause of the environmental damage to Lake Okeechobee?

Mr. SHAW. What we have is the river itself being channelized, and that gives a straight shot now into Lake Okeechobee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand that.

Mr. SHAW. That has agricultural runoff on both sides. As land became more valuable in south Florida, the dairy industry was pushed up into an area north of the lake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHAW was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the point I am trying to make is, the State of Florida has admitted that they are responsible for the pollution or a large part of the pollution in that river, and I just wondered if the Federal Government should be picking up the tab for a problem that the State of Florida has admitted they are responsible for.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, the State of Florida does not own any of those dairy herds that are flooding or draining into the river. The State of Florida acquiesced in the Corps of Engineers' channelization of this river many, many years ago, there is no question about this, but I think the important thing to remember is the environmental soundness of this particular project, which is supported by the State of Florida, and a big part of the bill is being picked up by the State of Florida. The State of Florida is not out there saying, "Federal Government, come and fix this problem for us." We have committed many taxpayer dollars of the State of Florida to this project.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, how much have they committed? I am just curious.

Mr. SHAW. Five hundred million dollars. The previous speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], stated that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And the Federal share you are asking for is \$745 million?

Mr. SHAW. No; that figure is incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHAW was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, let me yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], if I may, because he made that point very clear in his statement.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the understanding on this is that the total project, if it were done the way it is conceived now, in the future, or the Federal share would be in the vicinity of \$250 million over the years. The State's share would be in the vicinity of \$500 million. The amount of money we are talking about for fiscal year 1994 is \$5 million.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to sum up by saying that there is no question that this will be scored as an environmental vote. This, in my opinion, is the biggest environmental vote of the entire session. This vote could very well determine the future of the Everglades, the water supply for all of south Florida, and the restoration of the southern holdings of the United States in the Everglades, including the Everglades National Park and Florida Bay, which is part of the Everglades.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not use my full 5 minutes when I spoke before, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, there have been some environmental concerns raised here, and I would like to quote from the testimony presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations by Michael Joyner, Director of Local Affairs for the Florida Farm Bureau Federation. At one point he said this:

Two decades after its channel was straightened by the Corps, the river has "healed itself." Water quality in the Kissimmee which empties into Lake Okeechobee is of good quality. The South Florida Water Management District has indicated that water quality is no longer a justification for the project.

In addition, as was stated by an earlier speaker, a Palm Beach article I referred to earlier had this quote concerning this whole matter of the pollution of the Everglades:

The legal battle cost taxpayers an estimated \$20 million before Governor Lawton Chiles acknowledged in 1981 that the State was polluting the Everglades.

□ 1040

In addition, there have been some concerns or questions raised about the cost. The \$745.5 million cost that I earlier referred to came to us from the Army Corps of Engineers in a letter from Mr. Richard Bonner, Deputy District Engineer for Project Management, dated December 16, 1992.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude with this, quoting from Al Cors, chairman of the National Taxpayers Union.

"In our view, that \$1 billion expenditure," which is the estimate by the National Taxpayers Union on the total cost, "will be spent quite simply to build a swamp in Florida. This would be an outrage at any time. But now when President Clinton is calling for a massive tax increase as well as budget cuts to reduce the deficit, funding this project would approach the outer limits of absurdity."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. Chairman, this project has been authorized. It has been approved by the authorizing committee, by the Congress, and the authorization bill was signed by the President. The appropriation for this project has been approved by the subcommittee and has been approved by the full Committee on Appropriations without any objections whatsoever. We realize the importance of this project. In addition, the local government is paying about two-thirds of the cost of this project.

We are talking about a project that created a problem in the State of Florida, a serious problem, so this restoration project is one that is very important.

As was pointed out, this is an environmental project. And that is what we are trying to do, clean up Lake Okeechobee and clean up this problem that was created, unfortunately and unintentionally, by the Corps of Engineers. So this is probably the most important environmental restoration project in the country, and we deal with all of them.

The local sponsors are doing their part. We need to do our part at the Federal level.

Actually, as has been pointed out, the project is important to the survival of the Everglades, and also, of course, to the water supply for all of south Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote no on the Duncan amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 324, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

#### AYES—100

Allard	Grandy	Paxon
Archer	Hall (OH)	Petri
Baker (CA)	Hancock	Pombo
Baker (LA)	Hastert	Porter
Ballenger	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bartlett	Herger	Quinn
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Blute	Hoke	Ridge
Boehner	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Roth
Bunning	Inglis	Royce
Burton	Inhofe	Sangmeister
Buyer	Istook	Santorum
Callahan	Jacobs	Schaefer
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Schenk
Castle	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kim	Smith (OR)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (TX)
Crane	Kingston	Solomon
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Stump
Danner	Kyl	Sundquist
DeLay	Levy	Tanner
Dickey	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Manzullo	Thomas (WY)
Dornan	Martinez	Torkildsen
Dreier	McCrery	Upton
Duncan	McHugh	Volkmer
Dunn	McInnis	Walker
Everett	McKeon	Weldon
Fawell	Minge	Wolf
Gekas	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Murphy	Zeliff
Goodling	Nussle	
Grams	Packard	

#### NOES—324

Abercrombie	Coppersmith	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Costello	Gordon
Andrews (ME)	Cox	Goss
Andrews (NJ)	Coyne	Green
Andrews (TX)	Cramer	Greenwood
Applegate	Crapo	Gunderson
Armey	Darden	Gutierrez
Bacchus (FL)	de la Garza	Hall (TX)
Bachus (AL)	de Lugo (VI)	Hamburg
Baessler	Deal	Hamilton
Barca	DeFazio	Harman
Barcia	DeLauro	Hastings
Barlow	Dellums	Hayes
Barrett (NE)	Derrick	Hefner
Barrett (WI)	Deutsch	Hilliard
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hogland
Bateman	Dicks	Hobson
Becerra	Dingell	Hochbrueckner
Beilenson	Dixon	Holden
Bentley	Dooley	Horn
Berman	Durbin	Houghton
Bevill	Edwards (CA)	Hoyer
Bilbray	Edwards (TX)	Huffington
Bilirakis	Emerson	Hughes
Bishop	English (AZ)	Hutto
Blackwell	English (OK)	Hyde
Bliley	Eshoo	Inslee
Boehlt	Evans	Jefferson
Bonior	Ewing	Johnson (GA)
Boucher	Farr	Johnson (SD)
Brewster	Fazio	Johnson, E.B.
Brooks	Fields (LA)	Johnson, Sam
Browder	Fields (TX)	Johnston
Brown (CA)	Filner	Kanjorski
Brown (FL)	Fingerhut	Kaptur
Brown (OH)	Fish	Kennedy
Bryant	Flake	Kennelly
Byrne	Foglietta	Kildee
Calvert	Ford (MI)	Klecza
Canady	Ford (TN)	Klein
Cantwell	Fowler	Klink
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Klug
Carr	Franks (CT)	Kolbe
Chapman	Franks (NJ)	Kopetski
Clay	Frost	Kreidler
Clayton	Furse	LaFalce
Clement	Galleghy	Lambert
Clinger	Gallo	Lancaster
Clyburn	Gejdenson	Lantos
Coleman	Gephardt	LaRocco
Collins (IL)	Geren	Laughlin
Collins (MI)	Gibbons	Lazio
Combest	Gilchrist	Leach
Condit	Gillmor	Lehman
Conyers	Gilman	Levin
Cooper	Glickman	Lewis (CA)



Lewis (FL)	Ortiz	Sisisky
Lewis (GA)	Orton	Skaggs
Lightfoot	Owens	Skelton
Lipinski	Oxley	Slattery
Livingston	Pallone	Slaughter
Lloyd	Parker	Smith (IA)
Long	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
Lowe	Payne (NJ)	Snowe
Machtley	Payne (VA)	Spence
Maloney	Pelosi	Spratt
Mann	Penny	Stark
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Stearns
Margolies-	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Mezvinsky	Pickett	Stokes
Markey	Pickle	Strickland
Matsui	Pomeroy	Studds
Mazzoli	Portman	Stupak
McCandless	Poshard	Sweet
McCloskey	Price (NC)	Swift
McCollum	Quillen	Talent
McCurdy	Rahall	Tauzin
McDade	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
McDermott	Ravenel	Tejeda
McHale	Reed	Thomas (CA)
McKinney	Regula	Thornton
McMillan	Reynolds	Thurman
McNulty	Richardson	Torres
Meehan	Roberts	Torricelli
Meek	Roemer	Trafigant
Menendez	Rogers	Underwood (GU)
Meyers	Romero-Barceló	Unsold
Mica	(PR)	Valentine
Michel	Ros-Lehtinen	Velazquez
Miller (CA)	Rose	Vento
Miller (FL)	Rostenkowski	Visclosky
Mineta	Roukema	Vucanovich
Mink	Rowland	Walsh
Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Washington
Molinar	Rush	Waters
Mollohan	Sabo	Watt
Montgomery	Sanders	Waxman
Moran	Sarpalius	Wheat
Morella	Sawyer	Whitten
Murtha	Saxton	Williams
Myers	Schiff	Wilson
Nadler	Schroeder	Wise
Natcher	Scott	Woolsey
Neal (MA)	Serrano	Wyden
Neal (NC)	Sharp	Wynn
Norton (DC)	Shaw	Yates
Oberstar	Shays	Young (FL)
Obey	Shepherd	Zimmer
Oliver	Shuster	

## NOT VOTING—15

Borski	Henry	Synar
Engel	Hinchey	Thompson
Faleomavaega	Mfume	Towns
(AS)	Schumer	Tucker
Gingrich	Skeen	
Hansen	Smith (MI)	

□ 1105

Messrs. RUSH, ARMEY, INSLEE, JOHNSON of Georgia, EWING, FRANKS of Connecticut, and PORTMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PAXON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ZELIFF, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike that last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, included in the fiscal year 1994 energy and water appropriations package are two projects of interest to me and for which I support funding. They are as follows:

Corpus Christi ship channel, Texas, is a navigation project which is budgeted for operation and maintenance at \$10,315,000. Continued funding of this project is essential due to the impact on the local economy. The project provides for widening and deepening

the existing channels—40.5 miles—and basins from the Gulf of Mexico to deepwater ports at Harbor Island, Ingleside, and Corpus Christi, and a branch channel to the port of La Quinta to provide a project depth of 45 feet. It also includes the construction of mooring areas and dolphins at Port Ingleside, one mooring area and six dolphins constructed initially with seven others deferred to be constructed when required.

Lower Rio Grande Basin, south main channel, Texas, is a flood control project which is budgeted at \$1,500,000 for preconstruction engineering and design. It provides the major outlet component of an overall flood protection plan for Willacy and Hidalgo Counties. The authorized plan calls for construction of a major channel extending from near McAllen to the Laguna Madre, and related fish and wildlife mitigation measures. The authorized plan would provide 2-year protection to rural areas which drain into the south main channel, 100-year flood protection to the cities of Edinburg, McAllen, and Lyford, and 50-year flood protection for the cities of La Villa and Edcouch.

Mr. Chairman, many of these areas are now under water from recent heavy rains. We still have much more to do, but this is a good step forward. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues from North Dakota and Montana in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. BEVILL, and the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, Mr. MINETA. I will first pose a question to Chairman BEVILL.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to clarify some committee report language that we are very concerned about. The language has to do with the Corps of Engineers review of the Missouri River master manual which guides the management of the river. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the upstream reservoirs on the Missouri River still have not recovered from several years of severe drought. Low water levels, the result of excess releases from the dams by the corps, have had a devastating effect on the recreation industry associated with the reservoir in our State. The corps agreed in 1989 to conduct an objective review of the master manual to determine whether the manual, last updated in 1979, reflects the contemporary water needs of the basin.

That fair and objective review process now underway has included Representatives of each of the affected States on the Missouri River.

Mr. Chairman, among the other things, the committee report calls on the corps to follow the legislative priorities and regulatory guidelines expressed in its current master manual until a new management plan is approved by Congress.

□ 1110

The question for the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL],

is: Does the aforementioned report language have the force of law, and does it, in fact, require Congress to actually approve any changes to the master manual that the corps may find appropriate?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, the answer is no. It does not. But our committee urges all those who are involved in this, the upstream and downstream interests on the Missouri River, to get together and work out a solution. We have had this come up in other parts of the country, and this is the way have approached it, and we hope that you will do the same.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the chairman. This is not an attempt at legislative preemption of the administrative review under way?

Mr. BEVILL. It is not.

Mr. POMEROY. It is not a legislative preemption? I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] for the purposes of participating in a colloquy.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Is it the view of the chairman of the authorizing committee that as the corps continues its administrative review of the master manual, that it should not be influenced by the language in the energy and Water Appropriations Committee report?

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota is correct. It is vitally important that the Corps of Engineers remain objective, and that their review remain objective, one driven only by the findings that are uncovered during the review process. Political considerations, in my view, should play no role in the final determination as to whether operational changes are warranted on the Missouri River.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank the chairman.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I join today with my upstream colleagues, the three of us who represent the headwaters of the great Missouri River, to express my concern about the committee report language regarding the review of the Missouri River Master Control Manual.

This report language, as we know carries no weight of law.

I would observe, and I suggest to the committee chairman, that the assumption stated in the committee report that: "the Corps management of the river may reflect a disregard for the priorities and project purposes set forth by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944" is misleading. It is widely agreed, and this is confirmed by the Justice Department, that Congress expressly has not assigned priorities or ranking to the purposes of these Missouri River projects. Congress has not assigned priorities in the past, and we do not do so now.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I would again like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for their participation in this colloquy.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman's outstanding work on this legislation and wish to engage the gentleman from Alabama in a brief colloquy regarding report language approved by the committee regarding the corps' management of the Missouri River.

In the interests of clarifying just what this provision is and what it is not, am I right to interpret, Mr. Chairman, that the committee's statement in the report regarding the Army Corps' water management of the Missouri River is a reaffirmation of current law and regulations and a reassertion of ongoing congressional oversight and review into a process of great interest to States up and down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEAT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate his work on this legislation and on this provision in particular.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$352,475,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,400,000 is provided for the Eastern Arkansas Region, Arkansas, project.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be

necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation, \$1,691,350,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that fund, and of which \$18,000,000 shall be for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities, to be derived from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601), and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Tucson Diversion Channel, Arizona, \$550,000;

Los Angeles River (Sepulveda Basin to Arroyo Seco), California, \$400,000;

Oceanside Experimental Sand Bypass, California, \$4,000,000;

Los Angeles County Drainage Area (Hansen Dam), California, \$2,790,000;

Flint River Flood Control, Michigan, \$2,500,000;

Sauk Lake, Minnesota, \$40,000; and

New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, \$250,000;

Provided, That not to exceed \$7,000,000 shall be available for obligation for national emergency preparedness programs.

#### REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, \$92,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hurricane, and shore protection activities, as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, pursuant to Title VII of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$35,000, to be derived from the Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, and the Water Resources Support Center, \$148,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$54,855,000 of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That no part of any other appropriation provided in Title I of this Act shall be available to fund the activities of the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

During the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed 100 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 101. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to close any Corps of Engineers District Office.

SEC. 102. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer any functions of any Corps of Engineers District Office.

SEC. 103. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to fund the activities of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

SEC. 104. Any funds heretofore appropriated and made available in Public Law 100-202 to carry out the provisions for the harbor modifications of the Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, project contained in Public Law 99-662; and in Public Law 102-104 for the development of Gateway Park at the Lower Granite Lock and Dam Project, Washington, may be utilized by the Secretary of the Army in carrying out projects and activities funded by this Act.

SEC. 105. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to implement Defense Management Review Decision No. 918, dated September 15, 1992, to transfer from the Corps of Engineers property accountability of automated data processing equipment and software acquired with funds from the revolving fund established by the Act of July 27, 1953, chapter 245, 33 U.S.C. 576.

Mr. BEVILL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order against the remainder of title I? If not, are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 12, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 106. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 6.00355 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the committee has done a very good job overall in holding the line on spending in this bill. The overall bill is about \$126 million less than fiscal year 1993, and it is also about \$285.476 million less than the President's request, and that is good. I want to congratulate the committee, both the majority and minority, for their hard work on that.

However, under title I, they have had an increase of 6.4 percent above fiscal year 1993, which is about \$234.22 million.

At a time when we are having these severe fiscal problems and the deficit running as high as it is and the national debt being \$4.3 trillion, we ought to economize everywhere we can.

The amendment we have before us here would reduce the spending for the water projects by \$234.22 million, and that would amount to a freeze at last year's spending levels.



I would submit to my colleagues that with the fiscal problems that we have that it is in order for us to have a freeze at last year's spending levels on these water projects.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana pointing out that this bill is not only significantly below the level requested by the Executive but also, in terms of budget authority, significantly below last year's level. This is a very tight bill, one that deserves the support of Members across the spectrum.

Specifically as it relates to the Corps of Engineers, I think it is important for Members to realize that we continue to have serious flooding problems in this country, hurricanes and other natural disasters that continue to bring pressure on local communities.

Since we, earlier in the last decade, provided for a very significant shift in our Federal policy toward cost sharing with local and State governments, an end to the theoretical pork-barreling of corps projects that had no local cost share, no local support from communities affected has occurred. And despite that authorization that changed the way in which we carried out these kinds of public works projects, we now continue to have a tremendous drain on the committee's resources from people in every corner of the country, people in this body of both political parties, who have asked for a great deal more than this committee has been able to provide.

Committee staff estimates that we were asked by Members to do twice as much to add to the President's budget in this area as we were able to do.

□ 1120

We did less because we realized that we needed to keep the overall bill down, that we could not allow the Corps of Engineers' project demands, however legitimate, however based on sound cost-benefit ratios, to take control of the overall funding in this bill.

So we only added \$234 million to the President's request of \$3.9 billion. I think to eliminate that kind of funding would set back projects that are authorized—and every one of them in this bill is—would set back timetables of communities across the country who are taxing their local property owners, their local taxpayers, to come up with the funds to match these Federal dollars.

Now, one thing that we continue to do at the Federal level is try to reduce our exposure to the costs of disaster relief that we inevitably pay when we do not fix the problems that end up displacing families and businesses and, in fact, killing people because communities are not prepared for the kind of flash floods that still exist all across the Nation.

This particular bill has done a great deal to do what I think the Members generally in this Chamber want us to do on water resources. We have not been profligate. We have been tightfisted. But we have had to respond to the legitimate needs of communities which have identified problems, and attacked them with their own dollars before they came to the Federal Government for our cost-share contribution.

I really think this gentleman's amendment is an unwise amendment from the standpoint of putting the Federal Government in much greater risk of paying far more money out for disaster relief than would otherwise be necessary. All of us understand that putting upfront money into existing flood control projects now saves us a great deal down the road when we still have the problem but yet have to bail out, literally and figuratively, individuals and businesses who have the dilemma that faces them after a serious natural disaster.

If we make the reductions the gentleman suggests in his amendment, many of the projects in this bill will be delayed. While they are delayed, citizens will be subject to pain and suffering caused by flooding. Our economy regionally will suffer around the Nation. This, in addition, will mean that these project costs will go up because, as we stretch them out, push them out further into the future, the construction index will go up and we will end up paying more money to get the fix that we ultimately know we are going to have to make.

So, while I understand Mr. BURTON's desire to appeal to our desire for economy, it's important to note this bill has already attained that goal, and I think it would be a serious mistake if we allow this across-the-board, meat-ax approach to undo the good that has been done by the committee chaired by Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman can enlighten me: If this 6 percent cut across the board would be passed by this body, in fact a lot of projects which have been authorized and have been appropriated to the fullest extent requested would have to be cut back, would they not? Coming from Louisiana as I do, in the Mississippi River basin, living in a city like New Orleans, which is actually below sea level, I can tell this body that some three-quarters of a million people live in an environment contained by levees which, if they did not exist, would flood over. They would all be displaced.

There are canal projects in this bill which provide hurricane and flood protection, and they would not go forward if this amendment was passed.

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman is correct, and I think his region of the country knows this issue as well as any.

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would certainly like to applaud the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and his staff for the hard and diligent work that they have put into this bill, as well as the fiscal responsibility which they have exemplified. I certainly rise in opposition to the amendment.

Coming from an area like many of my colleagues along the Mississippi Delta, where these issues of flood control are simply not a 1-day issue but a life-and-death issue affecting the future of the areas involved, it is one thing to live within the realm of things that are beyond your control, which most flood control is, I think it is very important that as we look forward to these issues, as a cost-effective measure they are something that will enable us in those areas of the Nation to be productive, to be independent, and in the long run they certainly are cost-effective.

They avoid, as the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] mentioned, the complications down the road that could be much more costly.

So I rise in opposition. I do not think the amendment is a good one. I think it limits the capability of an industry within the Armed Forces, the Army Corps of Engineers, to do the fine job as they continue to do.

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I want to oppose the amendment. I would like to tell this body why.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers has distinguished itself by service, not so much great, great gratitude across this country, but quiet, dedicated, capable service. We need to continue this.

When we have something good that works in Government, we should not eliminate it, nor should we reduce its effects.

We would reduce the effects of this fine body, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, if we cut its funding. I come from an area in Florida devastated by a hurricane, and if it were not for the work of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, much of the hurt and harm and alienation which we experienced there would have prevailed. But the corps came in, they did not lose any time; their efforts of prohibiting flooding, their efforts in removing trees, their efforts in removing all of the housing that was destroyed, it is just amazing what the corps did. They removed the debris, which was beginning to be a health hazard, a huge hazard.

We need to defeat this amendment for the very reason that if it were not for the Corps of Engineers, whenever

we have a natural disaster in this country, they move in quickly with great efficacy. So it is important we not cut their funding, but in some way seek to keep it stabilized throughout the life of this Congress.

I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Page 12, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 106. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 4.12363 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, Mr. Chairman, we did not pass that last one, which was a freeze at last year's spending levels. One of the Republican alternatives to the budget which was passed by this House was a freeze plus 2 percent. When we looked at that freeze plus 2 percent drafted by the Republican study committee, which I authored, we would have reached a balanced budget without tax increase—I say this to my colleagues again—without a tax increase in about 6½ years.

□ 1130

Now, if we take a reasonable approach to these spending bills and reduce them to last year's spending level, plus a 2-percent growth, not freeze them at last year's level, but freeze them at last year's level plus a 2-percent growth, we could balance the Federal budget without the Clinton tax package that they are talking about in 6½ years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is a reasonable approach. On these water projects, if we freeze at last year's level plus 2 percent, the amount would be \$3.74 billion and that would be a reduction from the proposed spending level this year of \$161 million.

I submit to my colleagues this is a reasonable approach. It is not a meat-ax approach. We will have to prioritize spending; but I say to my colleagues, if we really want to have a balanced budget, we have got to make these hard choices and this should be one of them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that I support his budget amendment. I think frankly the Government has to live within its means and everybody ought to share the burden equally, but as I understand it this particular bill is already \$126

million below last year's level. So even if the gentleman's budget amendment were to pass and were to be enforced by this Congress, this bill would not be affected because it is already below last year's level.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand the point my colleague is trying to make, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is within the bill, within the confines of the bill, we have a large increase in water projects.

I am just saying to be consistent with the philosophy we talked about, we ought to limit the growth in these water projects across the country to no more than 2 percent. I think that is reasonable.

Now, if they can economize in other parts of the bill below that 2-percent level, so much the better, because we have a fiscal timebomb that we are facing, so if they can reduce spending in other areas within this bill below the 2-percent level, fine; but the water projects, in my opinion, should be also reduced and they should be reduced down to no more than a 2-percent growth rate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate his being so kind as to give me the time; but the fact is that this subcommittee met. There were tradeoffs and they did cut other parts of the bill in order to provide room for the needed growth in water projects.

Now, you cannot say that the country only has needs that grow at 2 percent a year. You make tradeoffs. You cut in other areas that are not necessary.

I will tell the gentleman that my flood protection problems in Louisiana do not grow at the rate of 2 percent a year. People get flooded or they do not get flooded.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I understand. Let me just say that we do have to make a lot of hard choices. One of the hard choices that is going to be made today is the superconducting super collider. That involves thousands of jobs. We had to make very difficult decisions on base closures which involved thousands of jobs and a lot of heartache and in a lot of areas of this country.

We had to make a very difficult choice yesterday on the space program, the space station, which passed by 1 vote.

So within these bills, we have to make hard choices.

Now, I am not saying the project of the gentleman from Louisiana is not a top priority. Maybe it should be one we should fund; but I am saying that if we cut spending in this bill to no more than a 2-percent growth over last year, that is reasonable and the committee can go back to the drawing board and prioritize.

That does not mean that projects that are not approved this year cannot

be approved next year. They can be set in a priority way so that they are approved in a timely fashion, and maybe that of the gentleman will be at the top of the list, and I hope for the gentleman's sake that it is.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I share the concern of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Indiana, that this Congress and our Government has to trim back and control its spending; but this amendment takes one title, one section of this bill only, and does not look at the whole bill. Last year we did not have the money available to do some of these water projects. Some were already under construction and there were a few that were delayed the last 2 years because we just did not have the money in this area because of the firewalls set up between Defense and discretionary spending. So we were arbitrarily forced last year to withhold funding on some of these projects that are very badly needed by the local communities, both for flood control and for water supply. Those are two principal reasons why we have these projects in the bill.

So we delayed these; but if we adopt this amendment, we really have not saved the taxpayers of the country any money.

The inflation rate right now, I am advised by the gentleman, is 3.1 percent. Now, that would be added on to the cost of these if we wait a year from now. If we wait more than 2 years, this really has lost money for the American taxpayers, because no one has said these projects will not be built. I have not heard one soul here today say we are going to stop these projects. We are always going to put them on the back burner. We are going to wait awhile.

So if we should do what the gentleman is attempting to do, and I share his concern about cutting spending, but if we are going to build them sometime, the inflation rate is going to cost a lot more than this 12-percent reduction would because inflation just in 1 year was nine-tenths of 1 percent and who is to say what the inflation may be by the time this goes into effect for the fiscal year 1994. It might well be over 4 percent. So we have not saved one penny for the American taxpayer by the gentleman's amendment.

When we have an amendment that will actually save money, I will share with the gentleman and vote for it, but this would not save any money.

So Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.



The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 12, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 106. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 2.9967 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, Mr. Chairman, we tried to freeze at last year's spending levels these water projects, which I thought was reasonable. That did not pass.

Then we tried to freeze at last year's levels plus a 2-percent growth rate and prioritize spending of these water projects, and that did not pass.

So now I have a freeze at last year's spending level plus the rate of inflation, which is 3.2 percent.

Now, for goodness sakes, this has got to be reasonable. My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, just said, well, you know, if we do not do some of these projects that are very important and we wait, they will go up at the rate of inflation and they are going to cost more.

You know, that argument has been made before on weapons systems, on a lot of other projects, the superconducting super collider and other things; but the bottom line is we have to prioritize spending. We cannot do everything for everybody every day all the time. We have to make hard decisions on what this Nation should be spending its taxpayers' dollars for.

I submit to my colleagues that if we freeze the spending for water projects at last year's level, plus a growth rate that matches inflation, we are being fair. We are being reasonable, and we can prioritize these projects in such a way that nobody really gets hurt. Some of them will have to be done at some point in the future instead of doing them today, but we cannot spend all this money that everybody wants for all these projects, many of which are pork barrel projects, indefinitely.

Now, let me just tell my colleagues if they do not remember, that the national debt has gone from \$1 trillion 10 years ago, took us 200 years to get there, to \$4.3 trillion, and the interest on the national debt is one of the largest expenditures in the budget.

If we do not start prioritizing around here, our kids and our grandkids are not going to have the same quality of life we have had because we are going to have hyper-inflation. The Federal Reserve Board will have to print money to pay off a large part of the debt just so that we can stay even with the board.

I mean, the interest on the debt some people believe before the turn of the century will be \$600 or \$700 billion a year, well over half the budget.

We cannot take care of our needs for Social Security, for the health care problems of the Nation, the infrastructure and the military, if we do not get control of this runaway budget.

So I say to my colleagues, and I know you have heard this rhetoric before, we have to make some hard choices.

Now, my first amendment, which was a freeze, I felt was reasonable. That did not pass.

The second amendment was a freeze plus 2 percent, which would have got us to a balanced budget, if we did that on spending, in 6½ years without a tax increase; that did not pass.

So now we are talking about a freeze plus the rate of inflation.

Now, that is reasonable. That is something we should do. If we did that on every bill, we would get that deficit reduced in a reasonable way over a reasonable period of time and we would not face the economic apocalypse that many of us feel we are going to face if we do not make these hard choices.

So I would like to end, Mr. Chairman, by saying to my colleagues, you did not like the first one. We had strike one.

You did not like the second one. That was strike two.

But let us hit a homerun with this one and cut some of these projects and reduce the growth in these water projects to no more than 3.2 percent over last year.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to amendment No. 1. I was opposed to amendment No. 2, and I am opposed to amendment No. 3.

I say to the gentleman from Indiana, my friend and colleague, that I do not believe he really realizes the impact that his amendment would have. To print 9 percent does not sound like much, and I know it is important to go back home and be able to tell the people that we voted for cuts.

□ 1140

As my colleagues know, that impresses everybody, and that impresses me, but I want to say that my colleagues should also tell them, when they do that, that they voted to cut funds for flood control projects which delayed those flood control projects. Historically it has shown that for every dollar that is invested in flood control projects in this country, \$7 in benefits are returned, but that is not the important part. Think of the lives that are saved.

I ask my colleagues, would you not hate to go back home and say, "You know, I voted to delay that project, and, if it had been built, if I had not delayed it, just think of the lives and the property that could have been saved?"

The same thing is true for hurricane protection projects. I ask my colleagues, do you want to go back and say, "I voted for a cut. I'm sorry I voted for it now because, after seeing

the results of that cut, I wish I had not done it."

So, Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues this: This is the only bill you're going to get to vote on today, or tomorrow, or this week, or this month, where projects are actually studied to determine whether or not your dollars that are invested are beneficial and that the benefits exceed the cost. You do not have that opportunity anywhere else.

And let me tell my colleagues this: We have cut this bill to the bone, and the gentleman did not point this out, but I believe the gentleman from Louisiana did, that this bill is actually \$285 million below the President's request. It is \$126 million below last year. And we have cut it to the bone. We are not playing games with you. We are being honest. Yes, we could have added some more money to this bill and then say, "Take your 2-percent cut." Do you want to play games, or do you want to be honest with the people?

My colleagues, let us tell them like it is. We have seen politics on this budget deficit. We have been watching that for 12 years, and now it is time to quit playing politics on this budget deficit and all this talk about phony cuts. Let us just be realistic, and let us be honest.

I remember I helped put in effect the truth in lending bill, as my colleagues know. We really need a truth in budgeting bill. We really need to get honest with the people and tell them like it is.

We have got problems, yes, but this is a bill where we have stayed within every limitation. We are within the 602(b) allocation. We are under the President's budget. He wanted more money. We would not let him have it. But, for goodness sake, I say to my colleagues, do not come around here and cut flood control and hurricane protection. We have got 25,000 miles of inland waterways, navigable inland waterways, in this country, and those projects create jobs. We ought to live up to what we tell the people: We are trying to create jobs. This is really our priority in this country right now.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEVILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] says on the amendment, and I plan to support him, but I find it quite puzzling that the gentleman who offered the amendment, and he spoke, the gentleman from Indiana, only yesterday, when we had a vote up to do some real serious cutting and curtailment of Federal spending, that involving the space station where we could have saved some \$12 billion—

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time—

Mr. KLECZKA. The gentleman voted against that amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I take back my time here because the gentleman is talking about another bill. I just want to say that, actually, this 2.9-percent cut would be devastating to our 25,000 mile inland waterway system, the greatest in the world. People from all over the world come to see this inland waterway system. Eighty percent of all the exports in this Nation go through our 25,000 miles of inland waterways to the ports.

What is the significance there? We are talking about jobs. Every time we export coal, it creates jobs. Every time we export anything, Mr. Chairman, it creates jobs, and 80 percent of the exports go through our inland waterways system.

Now, do we want to delay those projects? Do we want to delay the dredging? Do we want to delay the maintenance? And that is exactly what would happen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote against this amendment. It is a phony amendment. Vote against it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and I am sorry I must oppose my colleague from Indiana again, but he made an issue that it was necessary for Congress to prioritize our appropriations, and I would not disagree. I do not think any Member here would disagree.

But, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague, that is what your subcommittee here has done already. Here are four volumes of testimony that this committee received, almost 7,000 pages, 7,000 pages of testimony from more than 250 of our colleagues here, a number of Governors, mayors, State legislators, businessmen, who testified that these programs are very necessary.

Mr. Chairman, we prioritized. There are more people in this Chamber right here who did not get projects that requested them than got them. We have already made those hard decisions.

So, yes, we have made the hard decisions, and I know it is very easy to say, "Oh, I voted to cut," and just blindly say that, but it has already been said, and my friend from Indiana recognizes it, that we did reduce the overall size of this bill, but our priorities were slightly different than the administration's were. They did not like some of these projects. But we here in this Chamber live with the projects out there, we live with the problem. The administration does not. And this is not a partisan issue. They do not see the issues like our Members here do.

But we could not fulfill every request that our colleagues made, Mr. Chairman. We did prioritize. Here are 7,000 pages that we had to prioritize. So, we made the hard choices.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 329, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

## AYES—96

Allard	Greenwood	Oxley
Archer	Hancock	Paxon
Armey	Hansen	Penny
Ballenger	Hefley	Petri
Bartlett	Herger	Porter
Bereuter	Hoagland	Portman
Blute	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Boehner	Houghton	Ridge
Bonilla	Hunter	Roberts
Burton	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Inhofe	Rostenkowski
Camp	Istook	Roth
Canady	Jacobs	Royce
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Kim	Shays
Combest	Kingston	Slattery
Cooper	Klug	Smith (TX)
Cox	Knollenberg	Snowe
Crane	Kyl	Solomon
Crapo	Leach	Spence
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	Stearns
Dreier	Manzullo	Stump
Duncan	McCandless	Sundquist
Dunn	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McHugh	Torkildsen
Fawell	McInnis	Upton
Franks (CT)	McKeon	Walker
Gekas	McNulty	Weldon
Gingrich	Mica	Wolf
Glickman	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Goodling	Murphy	Zeliff
Grandy	Nussle	Zimmer

## NOES—329

Abercrombie	Calvert	Edwards (TX)
Ackerman	Cantwell	Emerson
Andrews (NJ)	Cardin	English (AZ)
Andrews (TX)	Carr	English (OK)
Applegate	Castle	Eshoo
Bacchus (FL)	Chapman	Evans
Bachus (AL)	Clay	Everett
Baessler	Clayton	Farr
Baker (CA)	Clement	Fazio
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Fields (LA)
Barca	Clyburn	Fields (TX)
Barcia	Coleman	Filner
Barlow	Collins (IL)	Fingerhut
Barrett (NE)	Collins (MI)	Fish
Barrett (WI)	Condit	Flake
Barton	Conyers	Foglietta
Bateman	Coppersmith	Ford (TN)
Becerra	Costello	Fowler
Bellenson	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bentley	Cramer	Franks (NJ)
Berman	Cunningham	Frost
Bevill	Danner	Furse
Bilbray	Darden	Galleghy
Bilirakis	de la Garza	Gallo
Bishop	de Lugo (VI)	Gejdenson
Blackwell	Deal	Gephardt
Bliley	DeFazio	Geren
Boehlert	DeLauro	Gibbons
Bonior	DeLay	Gilchrest
Borski	Dellums	Gillmor
Boucher	Derrick	Gilman
Brewster	Deutsch	Gonzalez
Brooks	Diaz-Balart	Goodlatte
Browder	Dickey	Gordon
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Goss
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Grams
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Green
Bryant	Dooley	Gunderson
Bunning	Dornan	Gutierrez
Byrne	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Callahan	Edwards (CA)	Hall (TX)

Hamburg	McDade	Sabo
Hamilton	McDermott	Sanders
Harman	McHale	Sangmeister
Hastert	McKinney	Santor
Hastings	McMillan	Sarpaluis
Hayes	Meehan	Sawyer
Hefner	Meek	Schaefer
Hilliard	Menendez	Schenk
Hobson	Meyers	Schiff
Hochbrueckner	Mfume	Schroeder
Hoke	Michel	Scott
Holden	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Horn	Mineta	Sharp
Hoyer	Minge	Shaw
Huffington	Mink	Shepherd
Hughes	Moakley	Shuster
Hutchinson	Molinari	Sisisky
Hutto	Mollohan	Skaggs
Hyde	Montgomery	Skelton
Inslee	Moorhead	Slaughter
Jefferson	Moran	Smith (IA)
Johnson (CT)	Morella	Smith (MI)
Johnson (GA)	Murtha	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (SD)	Myers	Smith (OR)
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Spratt
Johnston	Natcher	Stark
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Stenholm
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Stokes
Kasich	Norton (DC)	Strickland
Kennedy	Oberstar	Studds
Kennelly	Obey	Stupak
Kildee	Oliver	Swett
King	Ortiz	Swift
Kleccka	Orton	Talent
Klein	Owens	Tanner
Klink	Packard	Tauzin
Kolbe	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Kopetski	Parker	Tejeda
Kreidler	Pastor	Thomas (CA)
LaFalce	Payne (NJ)	Thomas (WY)
Lambert	Payne (VA)	Thornton
Lancaster	Pelosi	Thurman
Lantos	Peterson (FL)	Torres
LaRocco	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
Laughlin	Pickett	Trafigant
Lazio	Pickle	Underwood (GU)
Lehman	Pombo	Unsoeld
Levin	Pomeroy	Valentine
Levy	Poshard	Velazquez
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)	Vento
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Visclosky
Lightfoot	Quillen	Volkmer
Linder	Quinn	Vucanovich
Lipinski	Rahall	Walsh
Livingston	Rangel	Washington
Lloyd	Ravenel	Waters
Long	Reed	Watt
Lowey	Regula	Waxman
Machtley	Reynolds	Wheat
Maloney	Richardson	Whitten
Mann	Roemer	Williams
Manton	Rogers	Wilson
Margolles	Romero-Barcelo	Wise
Mezvinsky	(PR)	Woolsey
Markley	Ros-Lehtinen	Wyden
Martinez	Rose	Wynn
Matsui	Roukema	Yates
Mazzoli	Rowland	Young (AK)
McCloskey	Roybal-Allard	
McCrery	Rush	

## NOT VOTING—14

Andrews (ME)	Henry	Skeen
Engel	Hinchey	Synar
Faleomavaega	McCurdy	Thompson
(AS)	Saxton	Towns
Ford (MI)	Schumer	Tucker

## □ 1206

Messrs. KING, LEVY, LAZIO, SMITH of Michigan, and OWENS, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. RIDGE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 265 which was just



taken, I inadvertently voted yes. I wish to be recorded in the negative.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA). Are there further amendments to title I? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE II

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For the purpose of carrying out provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act, Public Law 102-575 (106 Stat. 4605), \$25,770,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$15,920,000 shall be to carry out the activities authorized under title II of the Act, and of which \$9,850,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account: *Provided*, That of the amounts deposited into the Account, \$5,000,000 shall be considered the Federal Contribution authorized by paragraph 402(b)(2) of the Act and \$4,850,000 shall be available to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to carry out the activities authorized under title III of the Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law of the amounts available for activities authorized under title II of the Act, not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior under the Act.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau as follows:

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, to remain available until expended, \$13,109,000: *Provided*, That, of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund: *Provided further*, That funds contributed by non-Federal entities for purposes similar to this appropriation shall be available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed as though specifically appropriated for said purposes, and such amounts shall remain available until expended.

#### CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction and rehabilitation of projects and parts thereof (including power transmission facilities for Bureau of Reclamation use) and for other related activities as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$464,423,000 of which \$46,507,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), and \$160,470,000 shall be available for transfer to the lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund authorized by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (43 U.S.C. 1543), and such amounts as may be necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project as authorized by the Act of December 21, 1928, as

amended: *Provided*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund: *Provided further*, That transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund may be increased or decreased by transfers within the overall appropriation under this heading: *Provided further*, That funds contributed by non-Federal entities for purposes similar to this appropriation shall be available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed as though specifically appropriated for said purposes, and such funds shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein approved shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any national monument: *Provided further*, That all costs of the safety of dams modification work at Coolidge Dam, San Carlos Irrigation Project, Arizona, performed under the authority of the Reclamation safety of Dams Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 506), as amended, are in addition to the amount authorized in section 5 of said Act.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, to remain available until expended, \$282,898,000: *Provided*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund, and the amount for program activities which can be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1987 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a, as amended), may be derived from that fund: *Provided further*, That of the total appropriated, such amounts as may be required for replacement work on the Boulder Canyon Project which would require readvances to the Colorado River Dam Fund shall be readvanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund pursuant to section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618d), and such readvances since October 1, 1984, and in the future shall bear interest at the rate determined pursuant to section 104(a)(5) of Public Law 98-381: *Provided further*, That funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same purpose and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and such advances shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That revenues in the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund shall be available for performing examination of existing structures on participating projects of the Colorado River Storage Project.

In addition, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to cover the cost of work associated with rebuilding the Minidoka Powerplant, Minidoka Project, Idaho, to be offset by funds provided by the Bonneville Power Administrator as authorized by section 2406 of Public Law 102-486. Such offset will result in a final appropriation estimated at no more than \$282,898,000.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct

loans and/or grants, \$11,563,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by the Small Reclamation Project Act of August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a-422i): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$18,726,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program for direct loans and/or grants, \$600,000: *Provided*, That of the total sums appropriated, the amount of program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from the fund.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, and habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be assessed and collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund in fiscal year 1993 and such sums as become available in, and may be derived from, the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund in fiscal year 1994, pursuant to sections 3407(d), 3404(c)(3), 3405(f) and 3406(c)(1) of Public Law 102-575: *Provided*, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to levy additional mitigation and restoration payments totaling \$30,000,000 (October 1992 price levels), as authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102-575: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to assess and collect payments, revenues and surcharges in the amounts and manner authorized by sections 3404(c)(3), 3405(f) and 3406(c)(1) of Public Law 102-575, respectively.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$54,034,000, of which \$1,171,000 shall remain available until expended, the total amount to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

#### EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the "Emergency fund", as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U.S.C. 502), as amended, to remain available until expended for the purposes specified in said Act, \$1,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund.

#### SPECIAL FUNDS (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund or special fee account are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391) or the Act of December 22, 1987 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a, as amended), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the head "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the reclamation fund.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to

exceed 13 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

Mr. BEVILL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURE  
YESTERDAY

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HEFNER was allowed to proceed out of order.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask for this time is that there was a letter that went out this morning to a group of people in the House alluding to the fact that there was a fast gavel yesterday on my military construction bill that we passed here in about 25 minutes, which we are very proud of. We are proud of the work product and proud we had bipartisan support for this bill. There was an amendment that was scheduled to be ordered.

I just want to inform the House that nothing was done and there was not a quick gavel on this. We had the customary notification. It was on television. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] made her opening statement and I made my opening statement. Members spoke on the Republican side in support of the military construction bill and Members spoke on the Democratic side in support of our position.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] offered an amendment that was accepted to the bill. There was ample time that was awarded for Members to offer amendments that were in order.

I would not want the impression to go out to the majority of this House and the news media that we had a quick gavel and that the Member in the chair would gavel a quick gavel to pass this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to allay the fears of Members of this House by stating that everything was done in very short order and in very good order. I am proud of the work product and proud of the people that worked with me on the Republican side who supported our work product and the people on the Democratic side, and to assure the American people and the Members of this House that there was no short, quick gavel on the military construction bill yesterday.

□ 1210

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA). Are there points of order against title II?

Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF  
INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 19, after line 20, insert the following:

REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 10.07787 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this series of amendments is consistent with the series of amendments I had just proposed on the Corps of Engineers water projects. The Bureau of Reclamation water projects for fiscal year 1994 in the bill, the amount is \$908.274 million. We believe with the spending problems this country faces, that there should be some hard choices made. We believe, or I believe, that we ought to reduce the spending level on these projects to last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments, if this one does not pass, that I will propose, one at a 2-percent level. With the deficit problems we are facing and the interest on the national debt being what it is, and the possible economic problems we are going to face if we do not get control of spending, this is one area that I think we ought to make some hard choices and set some high priorities for spending.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this. It is a freeze at last year's spending level; not a cut, it is a freeze at last year's spending level.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, I think it is important that the Members realize this bill is very tight. Of course, it is below the 1993 level in budget authority, and it certainly is below the budget as submitted by the executive branch.

As it relates to the Bureau of Reclamation, I think it is particularly important to point out that we are no longer in a mode of developing irrigation facilities for inclusion of new agricultural lands. Increasingly, the Bureau of Reclamation's funding is for reclamation of water, for better use of water, for environmental purposes, really, and in some areas for a municipal water supply that goes to communities, to industrial and commercial purposes.

This is not the Bureau of Reclamation that helped settle the West. Those days have come and gone. Because this is still, however, a means by which many of our Western States' Representatives and their communities are served with water, I think it is important we be very careful about the kind of across-the-board amendments that we have had leveled at the Bureau of Reclamation just as we saw on the corps projects, which, of course, are in every State in the Union.

It is important to point out that the Bureau of Reclamation's construction program in our bill is \$6 million below

last year. That shows that this committee is not aggressively developing new water resources, as much as it is operating and maintaining in a cost-shared way those projects that are already out there.

We are mitigating problems dealing with environmental degradation when it has occurred in some of our wildlife refuges. We are doing things that I think are broadly supported.

This is not an amendment that would be backed by environmental groups who are intimately involved with the committee in finding the funds to do what we can to improve some of the projects that were built years ago without sufficient concern for the environment. This is simply an effort, I know, on the part of some to say "Here is another vote to cut," and because it is not the Corps of Engineers, because it will not affect Members east of the Mississippi, because it will only apply in the western reclamation States, I am concerned that there may be some people who would take a different approach here than they did on the Burton amendment relating to the Corps of Engineers. It would be terribly inconsistent and it would be unfair to those regions of the country that are using reclamation, that are using the Bureau because that is what they have available to them.

I know there will be other Members speaking on this issue. I can only say that in this period, when droughts continue to beset us, when we have tremendous pressure to improve our environment all across the West, it would be penny wise and pound foolish to delay work on these projects. It will simply increase the cost down the road and no benefit will accrue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF  
INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 19, after line 20, insert the following:

REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 8.27943 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is a freeze at last year's spending level plus a 2-percent growth rate. As I said earlier, if we froze all Government spending at last year's level plus a no-more-than-2-percent growth rate, we could balance the Federal budget in about 6 years without any new taxes. We are talking about humongous tax increases right now, as



everybody knows, which I think is going to have a debilitating impact on the economic growth of this country.

Some of the people in the well have gone down and said, "Let us be honest, these cuts are not necessary and we are misleading people." I am not trying to mislead anybody. We are not trying to make political pluses here.

The fact of the matter is, spending in this country is out of control, and everybody in the country knows it. If we can make economies in any one of these bills, these appropriation bills that come before the floor, we should try to do it.

What this amendment does, and it is not taking a meat-ax approach, as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] just said, it is merely saying we are going to freeze spending at last year's level, which would be \$816.715 million plus another \$21 million, which would bring it up to \$833 million. We are going to save with this amendment, we will save the taxpayers \$75.2 million, and we will allow a 2-percent growth rate.

I hope my colleagues got that. We will save the taxpayers \$75 million and still allow a 2-percent growth rate in spending for the title II section, Bureau of Reclamation water projects.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course, I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thought, rather than rise in opposition, that I would perhaps ask the gentleman to yield on his time.

The gentleman is aware, these are all cost-shared except for the projects that relate to Indian tribes, is that correct, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand many of them are, yes.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, so the local taxpayer is already committing to these programs, not simply because it provides some development scheme or some new acreage available to agriculture, it really in almost every case is a matter of these local communities taking care of their water supply problems or mitigating some environmental problem that has occurred over a long period of time.

I would ask, why would the gentleman want to reduce the capability of these local communities by some \$75 million, simply pushing the problem and the cost, because the construction index goes up, out into the future?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say to my colleague that we have all kinds of requests from local and State governments for projects, and we are taking more and more of the responsibility of doing these things on the Federal Government, not just in this particular bill but a lot of other bills.

It seems to me rather than enlarging the bureaucracy here in Washington

and enlarging Federal spending, we ought to be reducing Federal spending and putting the responsibility back where our forefathers thought it should be, at the State and local level.

Let me just finish. I feel very, very strongly that the Federal Government and this bureaucracy in Washington cannot do everything. I am not blaming Government workers, as some of my colleagues on the other side, I think have said last night. We have a lot of fine Federal workers, but the fact of the matter is that Government cannot do it better at the Federal level than we can do at the State level, and it seems to me we have to start addressing the real problems facing this Congress and this country.

□ 1220

And the real problem is spending is out of control. And anyplace where we can make economies and prioritize spending we should do so.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out that the Bureau of Reclamation is a good example of a shrinking agency of the Federal Government in terms of expansion of the West. Using water developed with Federal dollars is a thing of the past. The Bureau of Reclamation is downsizing, its staff capability has been reduced. When we included the provisions in the 1980's for costsharing, we brought local government to the table. Their money is now what is driving a Federal match. This is not somebody's good idea here in Washington that is being foisted on people who do not want it. We are working cooperatively with local governments providing the direction and the leadership so that we know where our resources can do the most good.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate that from the gentleman, and that is why this amendment allows a 2-percent growth in spending. It is not a freeze. It is a 2-percent growth.

We are not cutting, we are allowing spending to go on at no more than a freeze plus 2 percent. As I said before, if we do that across the board in Government we could balance the budget without the huge tax increases that my colleague and others are going to be supporting that the President is going to be sending up to the Hill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KLECKA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 19, after line 20, insert the following:

#### REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 7.20036 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we tried a freeze in this section at last year's spending levels. To me that seems reasonable. That failed.

We tried a freeze plus 2 percent growth rate, which if we imposed on all spending in this Government we could balance the budget, as I said before, without a tax increase. And I think most of the people in this country are for a freeze across the board in all Government spending. And we were going to allow an extra 2-percent growth rate, which would still get us to a balanced budget without a tax increase. But unfortunately, we have not been able to get the votes necessary to pass that amendment.

So what this amendment does is it freezes Government spending at last year's spending level, plus a 3.2-percent increase, which is the inflation rate over last year. I do not know how anybody can oppose that.

It is going to save \$65.4 million and still allow a growth rate of 3.2 percent. To me that makes sense.

Some of my colleagues say we take a meat axe to spending when we take this approach. We had an amendment a while ago by the gentleman from Tennessee in title I on a project down in Florida, the Kissimmee River project. From 1961 to 1971, this Government spent \$30 million to straighten out a river because they said that that was the way to control flood problems down there. So we spend \$30 million to straighten out that river. Now they are coming back and they want \$750 million to cut the curves back in the river. That does not make sense to me. But nevertheless, the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee was defeated. We are going to appropriate \$5 million to study, and I guarantee once that study takes place they are going to go ahead and spend the \$750 million to cut the curves back in the river that we spend \$30 million a few years ago to take out.

Now some people might say that that is a priority, and that may be. I do not know. But I do know that spending is out of control in this place, and we have got to control it. We have to prioritize.

My colleague from Indiana, whom I have great respect for, held up about four or five books a while ago and said this is testimony on projects many of which were not approved. And I congratulate them on prioritizing on some of those projects. But you can go to every committee in this House and show testimony on project after

project, issue after issue where there was huge testimony and many of them were not approved.

I am just saying that we need to really get down to brass tacks and prioritize to such a degree that we are not going to allow spending to get out of control any further than it already is. And the way to do that is to put a cap on spending.

That is what this amendment does. For these reclamation projects it says that we are going to allow spending to increase, but no more than the rate of inflation over last year.

I wish my colleagues, when they go home, and I do not think my amendment is going to pass, but I am going to get a vote on it, but I wish my colleagues when they go home would ask their constituents in addition to do they want more roads, do they want more water projects, do they want more buildings and so forth, more post offices, I wish they would ask them this question: Do you want your taxes to go up? Do you want the deficit to go up or do you want us to start making hard decisions, real hard decisions on where to cut spending? I guarantee that 75 percent or more of the people in this country are going to say cut spending first, prioritize spending, put a cap on that stuff, and that is what I am trying to do with this amendment.

I hope my colleagues will look favorably upon it. It is not a cut. It is a freeze at last year's spending level plus 3.2 percent growth rate. That is reasonable, and I hope my colleagues support it.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding because he knows he is yielding to someone who does not agree with him, and Members do not always do that.

I wanted to point out that in 1989 the Bureau of Reclamation's budget was about \$700 million for construction. The 1994 request was only \$432 million. It has been coming down dramatically. So the gentleman by targeting this area of the budget to bring down the deficit is targeting an agency that has been making its contribution to deficit reduction, to leaner budgets, and certainly this bill which the gentleman has indicated is below last year in budget authority has met that test. So I think the gentleman by targeting his amendment at this section is targeting an inappropriate place.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me ask one question. Is this section on reclamation above last year's spending level?

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman indicated that it is and I believe it is.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is.

Mr. FAZIO. But because most of the work being done in the Bureau these

days is more labor-intensive, most of the work is going into management of water, not of new construction, and we are getting a greater yield, as a matter of fact. We are getting more benefit from the dollars that we have already spent than from construction in the past.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I have a high regard for my colleague from California. We have worked closely on a number of issues around here. I do have a little disagreement here. I think a freeze plus 3.2 percent is reasonable, and I hope he and my colleagues will see fit to support it.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that now we are talking about the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. This applies, as Members know, to the western part of the country, and it applies to a part of our Nation that has actually suffered a great deal already from a lack of an adequate drinking water supply, clean water.

We are going to have the same amount of water in this Nation a thousand years from now as we have today, but the question is going to be how much of it is clean. This is what we have seen happen. I am very familiar with every project of any size of the Bureau of Reclamation in California and the other Western States, and I can tell Members that it amazes me how they have been able to actually survive, especially during the great 7-year drought that just ended in some areas a few months ago.

So they have problems in that part of the country, and it is our duty to help that part of the country and to work with them. I cannot imagine anyone wanting to cut those people 7 percent on their drinking water, with the pain and suffering that would cause.

These projects are matched by local funds. These projects have already been authorized by Congress, by both houses of Congress, and by the President. These projects have been approved for funding after extensive hearings with the Governors from our Western States, and the Members of Congress testifying. Any one of them will tell you that a 7-percent cut would be devastating.

□ 1230

So I urge you to vote against this. We are still talking about a bill that is \$285 million below the President's budget request and \$126 million below last year's appropriation.

The Bureau of Reclamation's construction program is actually over \$6

million below last year's level. We have done our work. We have made those cuts, and we are at the bottom figure that will allow these areas in the western part of our country to actually survive and have adequate water supply. This is what we are talking about.

Do you want to cut their water supply 7 percent? Well, let me tell you, you are going to be cutting it more than that when you cut the money 7 percent. That is going to mean some of these projects may be stopped and will definitely be delayed, and the people are going to have to dig up more local money, and we are going to have to dig up more Federal money in the long run, because these projects are necessary and they are needed.

We are not playing games here. This is serious business. I do not believe you could find anybody from the West who would not tell you that a 7-percent cut would be disastrous for them on these projects that we tell you are necessary and are needed.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEVILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

The gentleman indicated that this was a 7-percent cut. It may be a 7-percent cut, if I am correct, over what the gentleman has in the bill, but it is still a 3.2-percent increase, my amendment, over last year's spending level? Is that correct?

Mr. BEVILL. The gentleman is taking it piece by piece. We did not do that. We are talking about the whole bill. That is what we are going to be voting on today. We are not going to be voting on every little item in this bill. We would be here for a year if we did do that. There are over 800 projects in this bill. We always have that many, and actually, I guess, we have even had more, because we have been constantly cutting our bill and trying to do our part to keep this country within its budget. We have done our share. We have done this every year. We have given the President of the United States less money than he has asked for in his budget.

We have had extensive hearings. We have 2,000 people who come in our committee room every year with their spokesmen to testify. We have never turned anybody down. We want to hear the opposition. We want to hear the pros and cons and we never refuse to hear anybody.

We have eight volumes of testimony. As I say, the Congress has already acted once on these programs during the authorization process. We are just talking about funding something that has already been determined to be needed, and certainly we feel like it would be a slap in the face to hit the Bureau of Reclamation with a 7-percent cut.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. FAZIO and by unanimous consent, Mr. BEVILL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEVILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentleman for his comments and point out once again that this year the construction budget is \$6 million below last year, and half of the increase in the total Bureau budget is in the loan program which provides local communities with the financing to do their own projects. They are 100-percent paid back by those local communities. We are simply helping them with affordable loans. They are all repaid. There is no commitment of the Federal taxpayer to do this work.

So most of the increase in this bill, beyond the construction reduction, is simply going to help local communities develop their water supplies, and I think that is going to be in conformance with many Federal and State laws which we have imposed on them. We owe it to them to allow them to be in compliance in an affordable way.

I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, for his comments.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California, who is a member of this panel, is very much aware of these projects and very knowledgeable on them. He is correct, there is no question about it.

I urge a vote "no" on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 287, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—135

Allard	Camp	Eshoo
Andrews (TX)	Canady	Ewing
Archer	Castle	Fawell
Armey	Coble	Fields (TX)
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Fish
Baker (LA)	Combest	Fowler
Ballenger	Condit	Franks (CT)
Bartlett	Cooper	Galleghy
Bentley	Cox	Gilchrist
Bereuter	Crane	Gilman
Bilirakis	Crapo	Gingrich
Bliley	Cunningham	Glickman
Blute	Deal	Goodlatte
Boehliert	DeLay	Goodling
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Bonilla	Doolittle	Grandy
Bunning	Dornan	Greenwood
Burton	Dreier	Gunderson
Buyer	Dunn	Hancock

Hoekstra	McMillan	Santorum
Houghton	Meyers	Saxton
Hunter	Michel	Schaefer
Hutto	Miller (FL)	Schroeder
Inglis	Minge	Sensenbrenner
Inhofe	Molinari	Shaw
Istook	Moorhead	Shays
Jacobs	Murphy	Slattery
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Johnson, Sam	Orton	Smith (TX)
Kim	Oxley	Snowe
King	Payne (VA)	Solomon
Kingston	Penny	Stearns
Klug	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Knollenberg	Petri	Stump
Kyl	Porter	Sundquist
Lazio	Portman	Talent
Leach	Quillen	Taylor (NC)
Levy	Quinn	Torkildsen
Lewis (FL)	Ramstad	Upton
Lightfoot	Ridge	Walker
Linder	Rohrabacher	Weldon
Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
McCandless	Roth	Zeliff
McCollum	Roukema	Zimmer
McDade	Royce	

#### NOES—287

Abercrombie	Edwards (CA)	Klein
Ackerman	Edwards (TX)	Klink
Andrews (ME)	Emerson	Kolbe
Andrews (NJ)	English (AZ)	Kopetski
Applegate	English (OK)	Kreidler
Bacchus (FL)	Evans	LaFalce
Bacchus (AL)	Everett	Lambert
Baesler	Farr	Lancaster
Barca	Fazio	Lantos
Barcia	Fields (LA)	LaRocco
Barlow	Filmer	Laughlin
Barrett (NE)	Fingerhut	Lehman
Barrett (WI)	Flake	Levin
Barton	Foglietta	Lewis (CA)
Bateman	Ford (MI)	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Ford (TN)	Lipinski
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Livingston
Berman	Franks (NJ)	Lloyd
Bevill	Frost	Long
Bilbray	Furse	Lowey
Bishop	Gallo	Machtley
Blackwell	Gejdenson	Maloney
Bonior	Gekas	Mann
Borski	Gephardt	Manton
Boucher	Geren	Margolies-
Brewster	Gibbons	Mezvinsky
Brooks	Gillmor	Markey
Browder	Gonzalez	Martinez
Brown (CA)	Gordon	Matsui
Brown (FL)	Grams	Mazzoli
Brown (OH)	Green	McCloskey
Bryant	Gutierrez	McCrery
Byrne	Hall (OH)	McCurdy
Callahan	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Calvert	Hamburg	McHale
Cantwell	Hamilton	McInnis
Cardin	Hansen	McKeon
Carr	Harman	McKinney
Chapman	Hastert	McNulty
Clay	Hastings	Meehan
Clayton	Hayes	Meek
Clement	Hefner	Menendez
Clinger	Herger	Mfume
Clyburn	Hilliard	Miller (CA)
Coleman	Hoagland	Mineta
Collins (IL)	Hobson	Mink
Collins (MI)	Hochbrueckner	Moakley
Conyers	Hoke	Mollohan
Coppersmith	Holden	Montgomery
Costello	Horn	Moran
Coyne	Hoyer	Morella
Cramer	Huffington	Murtha
Danner	Hughes	Myers
Darden	Hutchinson	Nadler
de la Garza	Inslee	Natcher
de Lugo (VI)	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Neal (NC)
DeLauro	Johnson (SD)	Norton (DC)
Dellums	Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Derrick	Johnston	Obey
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Oliver
Dickey	Kaptur	Ortiz
Dicks	Kasich	Owens
Dingell	Kennedy	Packard
Dixon	Kennelly	Pallone
Dooley	Kildee	Parker
Durbin	Kleczka	Pastor

Payne (NJ)	Sarpallus	Thomas (WY)
Pelosi	Sawyer	Thornton
Peterson (FL)	Schenk	Thurman
Pickett	Schiff	Torres
Pickle	Schumer	Torricelli
Pombo	Scott	Trafilant
Pomeroy	Serrano	Underwood (GU)
Poshard	Sharp	Unsoeld
Price (NC)	Shepherd	Valentine
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Velazquez
Rahall	Sisisky	Vento
Rangel	Skaggs	Visclosky
Ravenel	Skelton	Volkmer
Reed	Slaughter	Vucanovich
Regula	Smith (IA)	Walsh
Reynolds	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Richardson	Smith (OR)	Watt
Roberts	Spence	Waxman
Roemer	Spratt	Wheat
Rogers	Stark	Whitten
Romero-Barcelo	Stokes	Williams
(PR)	Strickland	Wilson
Rose	Studs	Wise
Rostenkowski	Stupak	Woolsey
Rowland	Swift	Wyden
Roybal-Allard	Tanner	Wynn
Rush	Tauzin	Yates
Sabo	Taylor (MS)	Young (AK)
Sanders	Tejeda	
Sangmeister	Thomas (CA)	

#### NOT VOTING—17

Duncan	Hinchey	Swett
Engel	Hyde	Synar
Faleomavaega	McHugh	Thompson
(AS)	Mica	Towns
Hefley	Paxon	Tucker
Henry	Skeen	Washington

□ 1256

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPENCE, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Messrs. CASTLE, PAYNE of Virginia, and PETERSON of Minnesota changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, today, during consideration of the energy and water appropriations bill, I was unavoidably detained at the base closure and realignment hearing. Consequently, I missed two rollcall votes on Mr. BURTON's amendments. Had I been here, I would have supported Mr. BURTON's amendment to freeze funding at last year's rate plus inflation for the Army Corps of Engineers rollcall No. 265, and the Bureau of Reclamation, rollcall No. 226.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE III

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary for energy supply, research and development activities, and other activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisi-

tion, construction, or expansion; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 24, of which 18 are for replacement only), \$3,224,534,000 to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COPPERSMITH

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COPPERSMITH: Page 20, line 9, strike "\$3,224,534,000" and insert "\$3,192,634,000".

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer with my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] is simple. The amendment cuts \$31.9 million intended to operate the Department of Energy's advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR] and related fuel cycle programs.

The advanced liquid metal reactor program presents serious economic, environmental and proliferation concerns. Despite the fact that an internal analysis by the DOE's policy office during the Bush administration ranked this technology 21st out of 23 priorities, based on energy contribution and economic, technical and environmental factors, the ALMR program just keeps going, and going, and going.

The taxpayers already have spent over \$1.3 billion and will continue to have to pay substantially more for many more years. Even after the completion of the current program, at a cost of several hundred million dollars, taxpayers then will have to pony up to build a prototype ALMR, already estimated to cost about \$1 billion in current dollars, before industry ever will consider using this type of technology.

Also, using ALMR technology requires assorted new facilities, reprocessing plants, fuel fabrication plants, and perhaps surface storage facilities, all of which are fabulously expensive.

However, even if taxpayers could manage to pay for all that, we have no guarantee that industry will adopt this technology. ALMR's will continue to be less economical than new light-water reactors for the foreseeable future. ALMR's depend on an expensive plutonium reprocessing cycle, while advanced light-water reactors depend on uranium now cheap and abundant.

ALMR's simply cannot compete in the marketplace, and that is why the nuclear industry has staked its future on and put its own money into the new generation of light water reactors, not ALMR's.

Even if we assume that sometime in the far future the economics do shift, making plutonium more competitive with uranium, by that time the current technology will be obsolete.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not antinuclear. What we seek to do is cut only one advanced reactor program, leaving five research programs, four involving light water reactors and one

involving gas-cooled reactor technology, which have far, far more industry support, working to assure our Nation's energy future.

□ 1300

The prospect of funding ALMR development over many years with mushrooming cost estimates reminds many of the budget nightmare created by another breeder reactor program, the Clinch River breeder reactor, which Congress terminated in 1983 for economic, environmental and proliferation reasons. I was not here for that battle, but I know that cost estimates for the last breeder had soared from \$699 million to over \$8 billion before Congress finally killed the project. No one knows how high costs for a prototype ALMR could go, but, when we are still years away from the commercial prototype stage, and estimates are already in the billion dollar range, history tells us that huge porkers from little piglets grow, and we should recognize the markings of fiscal meltdown.

In addition to these economic problems, Mr. Chairman, ALMRs also present serious environmental and proliferation concerns. Independent scientists believe that ALMR's will not substantially decrease the need for or the environmental risks from a high-level radioactive waste depository. ALMR's will create large amounts of new lower-level waste. ALMR's also pose a proliferation threat because they both produce plutonium from reprocessing and can breed it from a reactor blanket, and anyone capable of operating this type of breeder reactor can separate out the plutonium.

President Clinton first indicated that the administration would seek to eliminate the entire ALMR program. Many Members have stated, with varying degrees of vehemence, that the administration did not go far enough in cutting spending that does not measure up to the high standards all our constituents now demand. Instead, now those people who demand additional spending cuts want to preserve their own programs and even increase them over what President Clinton requested.

Today we have a fairly easy opportunity to reject business as usual by cutting a program that simply does not measure up. Today we can cut wasteful spending, protect the environment and prevent nuclear proliferation all at once. Reduce the deficit, protect the environment, bag the breeder.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

The centerpiece of DOE's advanced reactor program is the integral fast reactor [IFR]. The IFR is a revolutionary technology still under development

that has truly remarkable next-century characteristics; walk-away safety, easier waste management, proliferation resistance, potentially favorable economics and the fuel efficiencies necessary to allow nuclear power to supply our Nation's energy needs for the next century.

In the past it has been implied that the light-water reactors are the only reactors for which there is commercial interest. More properly there is no commercial interest at this time in any new reactor designs because of the vexing problems posed by nuclear waste disposal. Light-water reactors do not address the waste problem, but the IFR does. In addition, the IFR program has garnered significant commercial interest with direct funding from both Japanese and American utilities.

Moreover, the IFR technology specifically addresses the major shortcoming of the light-water designs, waste disposal. The IFR is designed to operate on recycled fuel, thus the need to enrich uranium or produce it is eliminated.

The IFR technology permits practical actinide recycling, which reduces the effective lifetime of high-level radioactive waste from millions of years to a few hundred years. The IFR is designed to recycle and burn its own actinides, providing technical solutions for the long-term high-level nuclear waste disposal problem. The IFR is also a very effective burner of actinides generated in light water reactors.

The IFR fuel cycle has strong proliferation-resistant characteristics. The IFR process does not produce a pure plutonium product stream, rather its product is still highly radioactive and would require reprocessing for any use other than IFR usage.

I am encouraged by the IFR's rapid technical progress. A prototype demonstration of the entire IFR fuel cycle is scheduled to begin soon; fuel manufacture in October 1993 and spent fuel processing in February 1994.

Despite their significance, these benefits are just ancillary to a much more important goal, the IFR's environmentally clean large energy supply capability, which makes it a true next-generation reactor. For this reason alone the program should be strongly endorsed.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that issue was first brought before this body in the form of an amendment by Congressman Howard Wolpe to end this program last year. Congressman Wolpe is to be greatly commended for first raising this issue for our consideration. I believe that we should vote for this amendment to cut this program out.

First, we must understand that this is not a vote on nuclear power in this country. Many of us support the work that this committee supports, the ad-



ministration supports, and that we have supported for many years, which are the five advanced reactor designs, that are in the legislation. This does not touch those. Those are the designs that the private sector tells us have the most likelihood for having value to produce electricity in this country. We are talking about the liquid metal reactor, an entirely different approach.

Mr. Chairman, this question is whether or not my colleagues are for plutonium or against plutonium, not whether they are for nuclear power, as we know it, with uranium, or against nuclear power.

Now let us understand the three historical roots of this program. The first is the production of plutonium for bombs in this country. That, of course, is not what it is designed to do now, but that is what it is capable of doing.

Second of all, Mr. Chairman, this is driven by the fear that we will somehow run out of uranium to fuel our current and future generations of light-water reactors, advanced or the current generation. This has proven time and time again not to be the case, and now the projections for oversupplying uranium go well into the second half of the next century.

Third, this is driven by a vision that is very appealing, my colleagues, that we will have a limitless, cheap energy supply for this country. For 50 years this vision has driven the nuclear programs in this Government, and we have paid billions of dollars, and we have gotten some return on those billions. But again and again the vision has been enormously flawed, and in many instances it has turned out to be a nightmare.

Today much of the budget of the Department of Energy has to go to clean up uranium mill tailing, has to go to clean up the bomb facilities, has to go to clean up reprocessing facilities, has to go to clean up powerplants and other sites that are associated with the Federal Government. We are stuck with enormous costs of cleanup.

Now, my colleagues, what we have to understand here is that this program is not economically smart, not environmentally smart, and not smart for taxpayers at this point.

Commercially we do have the private sector engaging in advanced light-water designs that are in this legislation and supported by me. But over and over again members of the private sector say they have serious questions, or they will not put up money, or they will not have anything to do with the liquid-metal reactor. This is part of the test for us today as to whether this is commercially viable.

But something that needs to be understood is a fourth issue that has come into the picture in recent years, not just bomb production, not just a fear of a uranium shortage, not just a fear of limited energy. It is a fourth

claim: that this is a solution to nuclear waste. I say to my colleagues, if you have a nuclear powerplant in and around your district before this, my colleagues, you should be against this technology.

There is no way this technology is going to be the solution to nuclear waste in this country. If the advocates are right, it might, for our great-grandchildren, reduce a portion of the highly toxic part of the waste. But it does not reduce enough of it to alleviate the need for Nevada or somebody else to be the site of a deep geological site.

Not only does it not do that, the fact is it also costs more, perhaps \$84 billion more, to the current program we have to dispose of the waste in our backyard. And do my colleagues know how that cost will have to ultimately be raised? Off of our electricity consumers.

The waste disposal program is already set up, not for this piece of it, but for everything else, to be paid for by a fee on electric rate bills in this country. Now, if we go forward with this research and development program, as the advocates want, my colleagues, the logical step is to put its cost on the backs of the consumers of nuclear power in the current systems around this country. That is the proper logic to sustain this program financially. But there is another part of it that seems to be overlooked, and that is this process actually generates additional amounts, by up to 30 percent more, of the other kinds of nuclear waste we call low-level.

□ 1310

Guess who is dealing with that today? Perhaps your State, because it is the States' responsibility to get rid of it. And perhaps there is a fight going on in your State right now over building a low-level waste repository, that must be built. And guess what? No State yet has been able to find a place for its repository for the stuff. The State of Idaho wants us to take what we have there now and get it out. The State of South Carolina says take what you have there now and get it out. But we have no State that has yet met the terms of the act that requires States to come up with disposal sites. So not only is it not going to solve the long-term problem for the waste in your backyard, it is going to generate additional kinds of low-level waste.

The DOE is developing an advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR] that will use plutonium as a fuel. This program is unnecessary, dangerous, and expensive. As a result the Copersmith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment to terminate funding for this program has been endorsed by taxpayer organizations, environmentalists, and arms control groups.

ALMR'S ARE NOT NECESSARY TO PRESERVE THE  
NUCLEAR OPTION

There are basically two different kinds of nuclear power reactors: First, light-water reactors

that use uranium as a fuel with a once-through fuel cycle; and, second, liquid-metal reactors that use plutonium as a fuel with reprocessing of used fuel.

Currently, utilities rely on uranium light-water reactors. The nuclear power industry has indicated that its future depends upon the success of a new generation of advanced light-water reactors that will be safer and more economical than present plants. The DOE currently has a program to develop advanced light-water reactors which is industry co-funded.

In fact, the 1992 study by the National Academy of Sciences gave advanced light-water reactors the highest ranking for overall performance in its evaluation.

The capital costs of producing plutonium fuel are necessarily higher than those of uranium fuel because of the extra costs of reprocessing. As a result, the price of uranium ore would have to increase fifteenfold before plutonium would be competitive. However, uranium is so cheap and abundant that U.S. uranium miners and fuel fabricators are actually going out of business.

Therefore, plutonium reactors are not expected to be competitive with uranium reactors for at least 40–60 years, if ever. By that time, the ALMR technology currently being developed would be obsolete.

ALMR WILL NOT BE ENVIRONMENTALLY BENEFICIAL

There are two kinds of high-level radioactive wastes in spent fuel from nuclear power plants: actinides and fission products. Actinides are elements with an atomic number of 89 or higher, including plutonium. Fission products are elements that result from the fissioning process and cannot be split further to release energy.

The DOE program for the disposal of spent fuel will rely on placing wastes in a deep, geologic repository that will have to be safe for thousands of years. Currently, the actinides and the fission products in spent fuel would be kept mixed together and would be directly disposed of in the repository.

Supporters of the ALMR program contend that ALMR's could help solve the waste disposal problem by recycling actinides into fuel. However, independent scientists, including a team of researchers headed by experts from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, agree that actinide recycling would not be environmentally beneficial or cost effective.

The greatest environmental risk from the repository comes from those fission products that are long-lived and water soluble, such as technetium-99 and iodine-129—not actinides. Furthermore, actinide recycling would not help expand the capacity of the repository since the current limit is not physical space, but rather a legal restriction.

In addition, actinide recycling transmutes actinides into fission products as an extremely slow rate. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory estimates that it would take about 1,000 years to completely recycle projected spent fuel from light-water reactors through an ALMR recycling system. During this lengthy period of time, high-level radioactive wastes would have to be kept at surface storage sites or other retrievable facilities.

Furthermore, the reprocessing process itself generates tremendous amounts of low-level

radioactive wastes that would have to be disposed of at local sites. The Lawrence Livermore study estimated that reprocessing of high-level wastes could generate up to a 30 percent greater volume of low-level wastes than direct disposal of comparable light-water reactor wastes.

Finally, the most comprehensive economic assessment to date, conducted by the industry's electric power research institute concluded that actinide recycling would not be cost-effective for waste disposal.

Actinide recycling would greatly increase the current cost of the disposal program—estimated at \$34 billion—since it would add the expense of plutonium reprocessing to the expense of the repository. The added cost of reprocessing 84,000 metric tons of spent fuel would range from \$25 billion—at the program target of \$350/kilogram—to \$84 billion—at current costs of \$1,000/kilogram.

#### ALMR'S PRESENT A MAJOR PROLIFERATION CONCERN

Supporters of ALMR contend that the new plutonium reprocessing technology—pyroprocessing—is more proliferation-resistant than current chemical reprocessing methods. This argument has three flaws: First, the true comparison should be to a uranium light-water reactor with a once-through fuel cycle, which is almost proliferation-proof; second, pyroprocessing is actually worse than chemical reprocessing in some respects; and third, the ALMR can be used directly as a plutonium breeder apart from the reprocessing technology.

Light-water reactors do not use military-grade uranium as fuel. In addition, the plutonium contained in light-water reactor spent fuel is mixed with other wastes—such as fission products—that prevent it from being militarily useful. As a result, light-water reactors are almost proliferation-proof.

An ALMR system can produce plutonium in one of two ways. First, the reprocessing of spent fuel produces plutonium by separating it from fission products. Although the DOE technology—pyroprocessing a plutonium that is less pure than current reprocessing technology—chemical separation—it would still be possible to convert the plutonium mixture to military use.

Furthermore, according to a report prepared for the DOE and the Department of State, in some respects pyroprocessing actually suffers from proliferation deficiencies compared to chemical separation. Specifically, inspectability and material accountability is more difficult for pyroprocessing than current reprocessing technology.

Finally, plutonium can be produced directly by placing a uranium blanket around the reactor and subjecting it to neutron bombardment. This process is called breeding because of its ability to produce more fissionable material than it consumes as fuel. The ALMR was originally developed as a military technology because of its potential use as a breeder.

#### THE ALMR WILL NOT BE USEFUL FOR THE DISPOSAL OF MILITARY PLUTONIUM

The ALMR system is a plutonium producer. Therefore, it does not make sense to develop the ALMR if the purpose for developing it is to get rid of plutonium. In fact, the ALMR would create an electricity system permanently dependent on plutonium.

In addition, ALMR's will not be able to dispose of military plutonium in a timely fashion. First, it will take another 20 years for ALMR's to be commercially available. Then, they would have to recycle military plutonium through their reactor cores for 100 years to transmute the plutonium into fission products. Meanwhile, the plutonium stockpiles would have to be carefully stored and safeguarded.

Many other safer and more cost-effective alternatives for plutonium disposal exist, including: First, conversion into a mixed oxide fuel that is run through a light water reactor and then disposed of; and second, mixing with spent fuel wastes, followed by vitrification and then disposal.

Madam Chairman, this is a smart budget vote to vote for this amendment. It does not meet our needs for the future. It is a luxury we cannot afford.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and want to recognize the fine work done by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP], whom I have joined in offering this amendment, and also the efforts of a freshman from my State, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Madam Chairman, the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR] is simply not justifiable on any economic grounds. It is not an efficient source of electricity, and it will not effectively recycle our current nuclear waste. Industry will not support it and there is no reason for the taxpayers to do so instead.

Commercial nuclear companies have shown no interest in contributing their resources to this research because they know that there will be no return for them. It will not provide cheap energy or waste disposal. This is largely why we abandoned the Clinch River breeder reactor nearly a decade ago.

Proponents will tell you how vital this project is to the Nation. But if that's true, if the nuclear industry could really dispose of its waste more efficiently with this approach, why hasn't the industry supported this project? It should be willing to share the costs of development if it has any interest in the technology. However, the total private contribution to this project comes from only one utility and amounts to only \$2 million.

Far from supporting this project, the nuclear industry has made clear its interest in committing all available resources to further study of advanced light water reactors [ALWR] instead of liquid metal reactors. The president of the American Nuclear Energy Council told the Subcommittee on Energy that the utilities "believe the ALWR—light water reactors—is the nuclear energy option that must take top priority in both industry and the federal programs in the near future." And on the recy-

cling issue he said, "we see no benefit in considering transuranic burning—the liquid metal technology—as a waste solution for current fuel."

Even if we were to develop and build enough liquid metal reactors to recycle all of our current stores of high-level radioactive wastes, we will not have reduced, even by one, the number of waste storage facilities we will need to build.

The international scientific community regards this technology as inferior for waste management purposes. Let me read to you what the International Atomic Energy Agency wrote about the prospects for this approach. "Indeed the incremental costs of introducing liquid metal technology appear to be unduly high in relation to the prospective benefits."

In 1980, Dr. Croff from Oak Ridge National Laboratory said there were "no cost or safety incentives for—liquid metal technology—waste management purposes."

And in a 1992 report, Dr. Ramspott of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory said "There remain no cost or safety incentives to introduce liquid metal technology into the HLW [high-level waste] management system. The economics of other options for producing electrical power, including nuclear, are far more favorable than liquid metal technology and will remain so for the foreseeable future."

So what we will be voting on today is whether we should develop a technology that industry has rejected for any use. It is not an effective energy-generation technology. It is not an efficient method of waste management. It does not merit a subsidy from American taxpayers.

Vote "yes" on Coppersmith-Sharp-Zimmer.

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I support the administration's position that we continue the research and development effort on actinide recycle. I do so because I believe it is important that we make a realistic assessment of the potential of this technology to address a part of our nuclear waste problem.

My support for continuation of this actinide recycle R&D program, should not be construed as an endorsement of the continuation of the ALMR design effort. At this time I do not believe we should continue work on this effort. Nevertheless, the issue is the vote on the amendment.

Because I believe it is important to carry on the actinide recycle research project, I have no choice but to oppose the amendment offered by Mr. COPPERSMITH whom I very much admire. I respect his commitment to his principles and look forward to working closely with him on other important issues in the future.



Nevertheless, at this time, I must oppose this amendment.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Coppersmith amendment. This amendment would eliminate all funding for the Department of Energy's actinide recycle and advanced liquid metal reactor R&D program.

Development of an integral fast reactor capable of burning or reducing nuclear waste is critical to the future of nuclear power in this country. Actinide recycling and advanced liquid metal reactors may hold the key to technology capable of burning high-level nuclear waste from commercial reactors and plutonium from our weapons stockpile. In the past 8 years, the Department of Energy has spent \$700 million on this program. This year, only 3 years from final proof of the technology, Mr. COPPERSMITH would like to scrap the entire project.

I believe that when we are this close to an answer on a question this important to our future, we would be short-changing ourselves to not finish the job. Moreover, by abandoning the program before it is completed in return for only moderate budgetary savings this year, we waste the \$700 million already spent.

More importantly, we may be shutting the door on the possibility of nuclear power for the future. Although we are in difficult budgetary times, I believe it would be shortsighted of us to turn our backs on research which would keep the nuclear option open. Without some sort of prospective program to address the nuclear waste problem, I believe we will foreclose the possibility of nuclear power for future generations.

Thus, I urge a "no" vote on the Coppersmith amendment.

Mr. MINETA. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

□ 1320

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I certainly endorse the remarks of the previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], his very well-thought-out remarks. I think it is important that we all realize that this amendment would strike all funding, all funding for the Department of Energy's actinide recycle research and development program.

I rise in opposition to the Coppersmith amendment, which proposes to strike all funding for the Department of Energy's actinide, recycle R&D program.

We are facing tough economic times, but this only means it is more important than ever to engage in false economies. It is likewise important for

us to carefully examine how Federal money is spent and to make sure we are investing it wisely in the future.

While reducing the deficit is an important goal, we must not, in our zeal to cut spending, shortchange our future.

I believe that money spent on securing safe and environmentally sound energy supplies is a valuable and necessary investment. Furthermore, as the supply of fossil fuels decreases—and it inevitably will—we must look for new ways to produce larger quantities of electricity cleanly and cheaply and safely.

Madam Chairman, the design of the IFR incorporates passive safety features that have been tested and demonstrate that this reactor is much safer than technology already in use. Safety is a primary concern of the public regarding nuclear power, and if we can achieve a safer program, then we should.

Furthermore, the IFR is a recycle technology, one that will provide a nuclear waste treatment alternative for DOE waste and commercial spent fuel. It can reduce the lifetime of high-level nuclear waste from millions to hundreds of years. This could significantly expand the usable capacity of a geologic repository for nuclear waste.

Finally, Madam Chairman, we in this Chamber frequently like to look abroad when we seek confirmation of our judgment. I might point out that strong international support exists for this technology, in both France and Japan. Should we abandon this project, these nations and perhaps others will be quick to fill the void. Japanese utilities alone are contributing \$46 million for initial program costs.

This is an important, safe, environmentally sensitive energy program with great potential for our Nation's future, but which faces a critical test here and now—today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "No" on the Coppersmith amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, equally divided between the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. MINK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object, could we determine how many Members might be included in that half hour before making a determination?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair sees standing seven Members on the majority side and five Members on the minority side.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, all of the time is going to be assigned out of the majority, by two ma-

jority Members. All Members here on the floor are involved in that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will attempt to recognize those for and those against the pending amendment. The Members who have been named would have the responsibility of recognizing Members, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH] on the proponents' side and the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], on the opposition side.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time will be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes on each side, proponents and opponents. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH] is in control of 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Madam Chairman, for purposes of debate, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT].

Mr. SWETT. Madam Chairman, we have a massive Federal deficit. We have got to eliminate unnecessary government spending. The advanced liquid metal reactor program—ALMR—is precisely the kind of program we should be terminating.

The nuclear industry does not consider the ALMR a priority because breeder reactors are simply not cost effective compared to light water reactors. Given the current glut in uranium, the size of uranium reserves, and any realistic projection of nuclear power usage in the foreseeable future, uranium-fueled light water reactors will continue to be far cheaper than the plutonium-based advanced liquid metal reactor.

We should not be spending our research dollars on new nuclear reactors. We should be spending the limited amount we do have on energy efficiency and conservation, and alternate and renewable energy.

Madam Chairman, we never seem to be able to kill programs once they get funded. This has got to stop. We should shut down the ALMR before it demands billions more taxpayer dollars.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Coppersmith amendment to kill the ALMR program.

Mr. MINETA. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our very fine colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I must admit that I am somewhat surprised that the gentleman from Indiana has brought this amendment today. I was one of those who sat through those long conferences on his energy bill last year, and one of the things that we wrote in that energy bill, when it became public law, is:

To encourage the deployment of advanced nuclear reactor technologies, to facilitate the completion of submission, by September 30, 1996, for preliminary design approvals of standardized designs for the modular high temperature gas cooled reactor technology and the liquid metal reactor technology, and, to evaluate by September 30, 1996, actinide burn technology to determine if it can reduce the volume of long-lived fission by-products.

□ 1330

We spent a lot of time deliberating on that authorization bill. A lot of us put a lot of time and effort in that effort, and now to have the man who basically, it was his bill, come to the floor and say that we want to abandon that, it strikes me as something where I am not certain I should have spent all those hours sitting around in a room somewhere trying to work out this bill.

I think we need to focus on the fact that the actinide burning, which is capable of consuming nuclear waste from existing light water reactors, offers every Member here who has a nuclear reactor powerplant in their State a means of reducing and getting rid of that nuclear waste now stored in pools all the way around this country and in all those plants.

Actinide burning offers the capability of consuming plutonium from dismantled nuclear weapons and significantly extending the uranium resources of the country. The actinide burning offered by the advanced liquid metal reactor technology is part of President Clinton's own budget request.

The amendment offered today not only kills the advanced reactor programs, but practically eliminates the entire request that the President has up here in that area. This amendment also would leave some of our top research facilities as nothing but empty shells without any mission and would backtrack from this Nation's need to have advanced research. If we are going to be an advanced nation, we need every energy option for our future economic growth, and this amendment throws one away completely. The one they are throwing away happens to represent 22 percent of the energy in this country today. To throw that away unnecessarily on this floor, and to do so in total violation of the authorization bill that we put in effect just a few months ago, seems to me is beyond penny wise and pound foolish, it is just foolish.

Mr. Coppersmith. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Lehman].

Mr. Lehman. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am in general supportive of the provisions in this bill dealing with nuclear energy, which is a key component of the jurisdiction of my Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

I support the continued funding for development of advanced light water

reactors, as recommended by the administration. Advanced light water reactors are the main near-term objective of the utility industry in the energy R&D budget, and benefit from industry's financial support, as well.

The liquid metal reactor, in contrast, does not enjoy significant near-term interest on the part of the utility industry. The waste management mission which has recently been put forward for this technology does not appear to have any prospect of being cost effective. Finally, the worldwide glut of uranium for the foreseeable future makes resorts to a plutonium fuel cycle, with all its downside risks, both unnecessary and uneconomic.

Under the circumstances, I do not believe taxpayers today should have to underwrite development of a technology that does not appear to have any practical benefits for at least 50 or 60 years, if then.

Madam Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walker], if this measure was really going to shut down the nuclear industry, we would have lobbyists clamoring for its defeat all over this building today. We do not. There is no support for this. Eliminate the program. Support the Coppersmith amendment.

Mr. Mineta. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to a very fine colleague, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Crapo].

Mr. Crapo. Madam Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment. There has been a lot of discussion today on the floor about whether this is scientifically justified or scientifically not justified, but I hold in my hand here the report by the National Academy of Sciences. I want to tell the Members what they said in the introduction of this report.

They were asked by the U.S. Congress to prepare a comparative analysis of the nuclear options for this country.

The question they were supposed to answer was, "If nuclear power is to be retained as an option for meeting U.S. electric energy requirements, what technological options are those that we should be seeking?" A lot of discussion has been put into the fact that advanced light water reactors are the ones that should be focused on, and yes, this report did say that advanced light water reactors for the short term are the ones that are in the best position to meet our immediate short-term needs.

However, the Academy's report on the long-term needs for the nuclear industry in this country and for our nuclear energy needs in this country said, "The committee believes that the LMR, the liquid metal reactor, should have the highest priority for long-term nuclear technology development."

The committee that studied this and has put this bill forward on the floor has said for the nuclear energy option in America to remain viable, we must

continue this research. The Department of Energy has recently sent us a letter stating they need to continue this research, that the actinide technology we are discussing is the high level importance, and is important to helping us continue to address our nuclear needs in the country.

The science is there. The question is, why are we facing this opposition. I am convinced that it will have the impact of eliminating the nuclear option in this country long-term.

It has been said that this technology will breed the possibility for more plutonium. Yet we faced this question in the hearings on this issue. This is not a breeder reactor. The attacks on this kind of reactor are focusing on a reactor version that is years behind us. This reactor consumes plutonium, it consumes spent nuclear fuel, and it is part of the answer to the many difficult questions we will be facing long-term. It is also a part of the answer to our Nation's energy needs.

As has already been mentioned, the reactor technology that we are looking at is going to be a critical part of our future electricity needs. Those who are concerned about the environment and the need to rely on fossil fuels will have to focus on long-term nuclear energy as a part of our Nation's long-term energy solutions.

It has been stated that there is not support in the commercial industry. That also is not accurate. As we know today, it is very difficult to get nuclear technology licensed, and the United States must participate in that process in its research at the initial stages. Yet already at these early stages of this development there are those in the commercial industry and those overseas who are indicating their willingness to become involved.

Mr. Chairman, this technology is critical. It has been identified by the National Academy of Sciences as our highest long-term priority if we are to maintain a nuclear option. We must oppose this amendment.

As to the comments that this is a cut, it is unnecessary expenditure, this appropriation already has been cut deeply beyond previous years. The question now is whether to eliminate it entirely. The effort is to take away our long-term nuclear options. We have to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Coppersmith. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. Sharp. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Miller of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Sharp. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, quickly, brief points about those reports, and the one from the National Academy of Sciences. In fact, the NAS report



makes it very clear that, of course, as my colleague said, it is not of use in the short term, but in fact it is only of use economically if we go to the breeder option. Meanwhile, our colleague and others are trying to deny that this is a breeder technology.

The key about breeding is: We create more plutonium than we destroy, and we enhance the risk of nuclear proliferation, which is a whole other issue that some of our speakers are going to address.

I might add that a private sector study of this industry by the Electric Power Research Institute, says this technology is simply not cost-effective for waste disposal. That is, in respect to those arguments about the pools of nuclear waste in our back yards, it is not cost-effective as part of a program to dispose of that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Coppersmith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment, and urge our colleagues to support it, because we simply must choose priorities, and the payoff here is so remote and the deficit is so immediate that we must accept this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. Even if liquid metal reactors were technically all that their boosters claim, any possible commercial application of this technology is so remote that the expenditure of \$32 million in scarce taxpayer funds is not justified.

Liquid metal reactors do not represent the next generation of reactor technology. That generation consists of the advanced light water reactors that still receive full funding in the proposed budget. Whether any light water reactors will be ordered and built in the next 20 years is problematic at best.

The world market is glutted with uranium for the foreseeable future, and the decommissioning of nuclear weapons both here and in the former Soviet Union will greatly exacerbate that glut. Consequently, there is no near-term need for plutonium reactors. Unless hundreds of additional uranium reactors are built—an unlikely scenario given their economics and unpopularity—the plutonium recycle technology inherent in the ALMR will not be economic.

Supporters of the ALMR claim that it would be an inexhaustible energy supply. For that to be the case, it would have to be used as a breeder reactor, which converts uranium into plutonium, the raw material for nuclear weapons. By promoting a fuel cycle based on plutonium, the ALMR represents a serious nuclear proliferation threat.

Finally, independent experts at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory estimate that the proposed nuclear waste management mission for the ALMR would roughly quadruple the cost of waste disposal.

Since the potential payoff for this program is so remote, and the budget deficit is so immediate, I do not believe that the ALMR Program deserves any taxpayer funds at this time. I urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our fine colleague,

the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE].

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this motion for two reasons, because of the two deficits, not the one deficit, the two deficits that our country has.

The first deficit that this debate has largely ignored is the environmental deficit, the deficit we have created in leaving a legacy for our great-great-grandchildren of leaving high-level nuclear waste around this country and around this world. When we have an option to convert high-level nuclear waste that will be with our grandchildren for 10,000 years into a low-level product that can last only for 100 years, what course should this Nation take?

□ 1340

This Nation should spend a dollar today to develop a technology to save the multiple generations 10,000 years from now, and let it only last for 100 years. This is an environmental deficit issue.

Secondly, it is a Federal budget deficit issue. Let me tell Members where we are spending the money today. The Federal Government is spending over \$1 billion a year in my district. By the way, this project is not in my district. But we are spending over \$1 billion a year taking care of high-level nuclear waste in my district.

If we can spend a dollar today to reduce that to low-level nuclear waste and save money, this is well worth it. This is a rifle shot aimed at the breeder reactor that is going to miss, and if it hits, it is going to kill something that can help our grandchildren, and our grandchildren's grandchildren, and our grandchildren's grandchildren's grandchildren.

Oppose this amendment.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for offering this amendment. This is a good amendment for three reasons.

One, this program is bad fiscal policy. The Clinch River breeder started it off at \$700 million. It wound up at \$8 billion of taxpayers' money. That was lost. This program is going to wind up at \$2 billion. Adam Smith spins in his grave as he looks at this Congress appropriating money for a private-sector endeavor, because the second point is also valid.

This is bad energy policy. There has not been a new nuclear power plant ordered in the United States which has been constructed for 18 years. But at the same time, the electric utility industry is the wealthiest industry in the United States. If they think this is a good idea, then the wealthiest industry in the United States should fund it, not the taxpayers of our country.

But most importantly, this is bad nonproliferation policy. This is a solution that really is creating a new problem. It is disguised as a solution. In fact, the Department of Energy in a report which the chairman of our subcommittee had to have released, because it had been kept classified last week, reveals in fact that the unsolved problems with this technology include safeguards, plant inspectability, material accountability for the purposes of verification meaning that we are creating a plutonium economy across the planet. Just so Members understand what we are talking about, dozens of these reactors would have to operate for hundreds of years in order to consume all of the plutonium in all of the nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union or the United States, if that was the purpose of it. We are talking dozens of reactors for hundreds of years.

But we have no way of guaranteeing that the plutonium would not be diverted into nuclear weapons programs in countries that do not have them. The safeguards do not work.

The problem no longer, ladies and gentlemen, is the vertical arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R. It is the horizontal arms race as it spreads from country to country and subnational group to subnational group.

This is the worst possible program that we could be subsidizing with taxpayer money.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The argument has been made this afternoon that this may not be the future of nuclear energy. Does anyone question that nuclear energy is going to be a part of our future for this country?

The argument against this seems to be not whether this is appropriate technology, but whether we are going to have nuclear energy in our future. Most of the utilities who today have not bought any type of nuclear generation have not done so because they do not believe in it. It is because of two factors. First, the safety factor and second, what are we going to do with the waste.

This is a complement to the light-water reactors or any other reactor. First, it is passively more safe than other reactors we have in the inventory or that are likely to come into the inventory. Second, is the fact that it is going to do away with the waste. It accommodates both reasons why it will be in the future of some utilities. So it is not cost effective or may not be. We do not know.

But I am concerned that some Members, including my colleague from Indiana who was one of the architects of

the Energy Act last year, which supported this technology, now opposes it. Something is wrong.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I would just note in response that this amendment does not close the nuclear option. This bill funds five other advanced reactor programs. I support those programs. Industry supports those programs through cost-sharing. I urge Members to support the bill—once we take out the one reactor research program that simply does not measure up.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, if truth in advertising laws had to apply to the Federal budget, Congress would probably have to write the following ad for the advanced liquid metal reactor funding request:

Wanted: \$21.9 million for a technologically and economically unsound program almost identical to one Congress rejected at taxpayers' insistence 10 years ago, when the national debt was about one-third what it is today. This "handyman's special" can be brought up to its intended capacity with a cash infusion of a few billion.

How would America's taxpayers react to an ad like this. Their first reaction would be disbelief—after all, who would propose such a costly project at a time of unparalleled fiscal crisis? Yet, this is exactly what the 103d Congress is prepared to do: Throw good money after bad on the advanced liquid metal reactor, a project in search of a mission.

In 1983, Congress voted to terminate the Clinch River breeder reactor, which would have been our first full scale liquid metal fast breeder reactor. We did not need the CRBR and the environmental problems that traveled with it.

Although Congress scuttled construction of the liquid metal reactor that was to be built at Clinch River, we have continued to spend millions on research. I never suspected how much money could be won in beating long-dead horses, but the advocates of the advanced liquid metal reactor have turned it into a pension program.

The advanced liquid metal reactor is the same old turkey dressed up in different feathers. In fact it is a dodo. But the taxpayers see through it.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH] and his colleagues.

Let me first preface my remarks by saluting my colleagues for their sincere desire to reduce the deficit. The elimination of any program accomplishes this, and I totally agree that reducing the deficit should be one of our top priorities. However, the administration is proposing to increase spending for DOE civilian programs by nearly \$1.2 billion in fiscal

year 1994—an increase of almost 17 percent over the current level of funding. DOE's fiscal year 1994 budget request is not about deficit reduction—it is about a calculated and radical shift away from nuclear energy—a vital technology that supplies more than one-fifth of our Nation's electricity without emitting any greenhouse gases, and a technology that must be maintained if there is any hope of meeting the President's Earth Day commitment to reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases to their 1990 levels by the year 2000.

I want to take a few moments to address the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR] integral fast reactor [IFR] fuel cycle program. The IFR program has been the centerpiece of the Department of Energy's [DOE's] advanced reactor R&D program. This revolutionary technology, still under development, offers a safe, economically promising, and environmentally sound solution to many of the concerns raised about nuclear power. It has also received the resounding endorsement from the most respected members of the scientific community: The June, 1992, National Academy of Sciences' study on the future of nuclear power, "Nuclear Power: Technical and Institutional Options for the Future," recommended that the IFR should be the highest long-term nuclear option and called for expansion of the existing design activity.

The IFR's advantages include passive, walk-away safety; proliferation resistance; dramatically reduced waste-disposal problems; a fuel cycle that is integral, self-contained and potentially less expensive; and a fuel supply that is nearly inexhaustible.

Passive, walk-away safety. The IFR technology is much safer than current reactor designs. Its inherent passive safety characteristics were demonstrated in 1986 in a landmark series of tests at Argonne's IFR prototype reactor [EBR-II] in Idaho, where simulations of the Three Mile Island and Chernobyl-type accidents resulted in immediate and harmless system shutdown without any damage to the reactor or the environment and with no risk of radioactive release.

Proliferation resistance. The IFR fuel cycle has strong proliferation-resistance characteristics because it does not produce a pure plutonium product stream; its product is still highly radioactive and would require sophisticated reprocessing for anything other than IFR usage.

Dramatically reduced waste-disposal problems. The IFR technology permits practical radioactive by-product—actinide—recycling, which reduces the effective lifetime of high-level nuclear waste from millions of years to a few hundred years and the high-level waste volume by a factor of 4 or more. The IFR is also designed to recycle and burn its own actinides, the actinides generated in traditional light water reactors [LWR's] or even excess plutonium available due to nuclear disarmament, providing solutions for the long-term high-level nuclear waste disposal problem.

Integral, self-contained, and potentially less expensive fuel cycle. In the IFR fuel cycle, a relatively high-temperature, metal-based batch process—the pyroprocess—has the potential to be carried out in small, relatively inexpensive facilities.

Nearly inexhaustible fuel supply. The IFR has the capability to breed more fuel than it

consumes, thereby providing a nearly inexhaustible fuel supply and allowing nuclear power to supply America's energy needs for centuries without producing any greenhouse gases.

The IFR program is making rapid technical progress, and is at a critical juncture. A prototype demonstration of the entire IFR cycle is scheduled to begin soon—fuel manufacture in October 1993, and spent fuel processing in February 1994. The IFR fuel cycle demonstration will be a major accomplishment that will assure the United States its international leadership role in safe nuclear power development. The demonstration schedule is on target to meet the Energy Policy Act of 1992 mandate assessment of the actinide burning technology by the end of fiscal year 1996.

The IFR program is now strongly supported by international participation. Japanese utilities are contributing \$46 million for the initial phase of the technology demonstration, including \$13.5 million this year, and the prospects for much broader international cooperation appear excellent.

The U.S. utility industry, including the Electric Power Research Institute [EPRI], has also begun to take an interest in the IFR technology. As a start, Southern California Edison has indicated its intent to start to provide some financial support, estimated to be about \$2 million this year, a landmark event in long-term reactor development.

We have invested billions of dollars in the liquid metal reactor technologies over the years—investments which were supported by both Democrat and Republican administrations and by both Democrat and Republican Congresses, on a bipartisan basis. In my view, it simply does not make sense to turn our backs on the ALMR option now that we are so very near the threshold of success—particularly in light of the President's national commitment to reduce greenhouse emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000, and the major implications of this commitment for the Nation's energy future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I rise in strong support of the amendment.

I am not an expert on all of these technologies that have been debated, but what we have here is an unusual coalition of groups that have come together in support of this amendment. We have the National Taxpayers Union, which is not known for their concern about the environment. In support of the amendment then we have all of the environmental groups, which are not noted for their concern about the deficit, coming together to support this amendment.

Number 2, people tell me in this body that programs never die, they just develop new rationales. I understand that we killed this program a long time ago because it was about breeder reactor technology, and now it comes back to



this floor today to save us from the future of the hazards of nuclear waste.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] pointed out earlier that other countries are involved in this. I would just note that Japan has put up \$46 million, \$7 million per year, and we have put up \$700 million to \$1.2 billion, and my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] tells me that it will probably be \$2 billion.

We have an obligation here to put an end to this right now.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], cochair of the Republican Task Force on Reform.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. COPPERSMITH, for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coppersmith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment.

Nuclear power plays an important role in our country's energy policy. But we, as Members of Congress, must start critically evaluating programs. We have to start making hard decisions over what types of research we can afford and whether there is a real future for the technologies we are developing.

When we look at the future of advanced liquid metal reactors, the justification for this type of appropriation diminishes greatly. In the commercial nuclear sector, there have been no new permits for construction of nuclear powerplants in over a decade. Even if a permit were requested and granted, the success of light water reactors around the country, the experience utilities have had with the technologies associated with uranium reactors, and the high cost of breeder technology would indicate that light water reactors will be preferred over the advanced liquid metal reactors, at least for the foreseeable future.

Even in the Navy, where the Government is a significant user of nuclear energy, there are no plans to use advanced liquid metal reactors. Because of the volatility of this type of reactor, and the advances made by the Navy to maintain light water reactors even under the most adverse conditions, the Navy has shown no interest in changing to this new type of technology.

In this year of the deficit, we must constantly evaluate whether we can afford having the Government invest in every type of project. While I believe the research being done in this case would be useful, I cannot vote to keep spending money on a project with an uncertain future value.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this fiscally responsible amendment.

□ 1350

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As a fiscal conservative who votes over and over again to hold the line and cut programs, you might expect that I might be voting for this amendment. But I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

You know, this feeding frenzy of cost-cutting should not bring us to do dumb things, and if we stop this research, that is going to be a dumb thing for this country.

There are all sorts of reasons that we need to vote "no" on this amendment.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] has very eloquently given a number of reasons, primary among them economic reasons, for doing it. I would just like to stress that we are the world's leader. We need to remain the world's leader. We need to hold open the option of nuclear as a strong source of power in our future. If we are going to do this, we cannot vote for this amendment. We have to vote against it.

A "no" vote on this amendment for a great number of reasons is the right vote.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, since I am going to be advocating conservation of our financial resources, I have also been asked to advocate and to recognize conservation of time resources involved here.

The advanced liquid metal reactor is a program that does not have support from an economic point of view. It does not have support from an environmental point of view. It does not have support from a scientific point of view.

Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory found there was no justification for it and did not recommend continuation of the project.

It does not have support from the energy and power industries who would normally be expected to support it.

Indeed, we have a project that started out with a purpose but failed, and now we are asked to continue it with no purpose and no justification whatsoever. It does not satisfy the needs for cleaning up nuclear waste. Its benefits in that regard are illusory.

I think that if ever there was a project that deserved to be cut, this one is it.

I rise strongly in support of the amendment to strike this.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes, the remainder of our time, to our very fine chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], who has been so helpful not only on this issue but others.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that Admiral Rickover and President Carter made a statement that is still true today, that this country cannot afford the luxury of not having nuclear energy. I think that is even more true today.

We have over 100 nuclear plants today, and they are storing the nuclear waste at the plants. It is a problem that we are facing and we are working on and hope to move the waste to a central area.

I mentioned that because this is a project we are supporting and the committee has supported this program. The authorization committee has supported it and the Congress has authorized it and the President signed the bill. Now we are with the appropriation.

This advanced liquid metal reactor, in my judgment, is a good program, and has the potential to burn the long-lived radioactive waste that is going to cost so much money, so many billions of dollars to dispose of. It will burn this radioactive waste and utilizing the plutonium from the dismantled nuclear weapons, and has the potential of extending the supply of uranium fuels while producing electricity safely and economically.

The program has many benefits and potential. We on the committee have held hearings, and we have heard witnesses from all parts of the country on this and they support it. I urge everyone to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP], who has helped me with this amendment.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, this is not about the nuclear option. Many of us support having the nuclear option.

If you vote for this bill, you will have enhanced, with the advanced light water reactor design, four of them in the bill, and an additional gas-cooled reactor design, the option of nuclear power for this country and, indeed, for the entire planet.

What we are talking about here is whether it is the smart economic decision to also go for the liquid metal reactor. The industry itself tells us the smart way is to go with the other designs.

Second, what this is about is plutonium, and we know something very simple about this: Uranium, which the other designs are based on, is cheap. Plutonium is dangerous. That is why we are worried about North Korea. That is why we are worried about proliferation around the world.

Guess what the fundamental goal of this program is designed to do? It is primarily designed to make it cheaper and easier to transmute uranium, or take the plutonium out of the waste stream. Guess who would like most of all to be able to do that right today? North Korea.

Why make it cheaper? Why make it easier for anybody anywhere around the world?

But finally, the notion that this solves our waste problem is absolutely a siren song that takes us right on the rocks of wasted money and, worst, additional low-level waste. It only would reduce a portion of the long-lived waste products. We still have the fission products. We still have iodine-29 and technetium-99 which will require thousands of years of disposal. So those who do not like any of this nuclear waste, regrettably will still have to find a place for it.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Coppersmith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment to the fiscal year 1994 energy and water appropriations bill which terminates funding for the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR].

According to the National Taxpayers Union, the ALMR is simply a waste of taxpayers dollars. This amendment would save taxpayers \$31.9 million in fiscal year 1994 alone.

According to the Department of Energy and Public Citizen, the ALMR would generate more tons of high-level waste than it would consume.

And environmental groups, like Friends of the Earth and Sierra Club, are also opposed to ALMR. Breeder reactors like ALMR are a major source of plutonium which is a major threat to the environment.

Again, I urge members to support the Coppersmith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this program is an example of a technology in search of a mission.

The NAS study cited by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] said that the ALMR is feasible for electrical generation only if used as a breeder. However, the opponents of this amendment are saying now that the ALMR is not a breeder despite the fact that the scientists at Argonne and the officials at DOE all call it a breeder. Then, last year the Bush administration Department of Energy Policy Office ranked 23 electrical generation strategies and ranked the ALMR as 21st out of 23 options.

So the ALMR is no longer proposed as an electrical generation strategy, and the respected chairman of the subcommittee now advances it as a waste reduction technique. But page 152 of the National Academy of Sciences report, cited by my friend, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], says, "The actinide recycling \*\*\* feature is not considered justification \*\*\* for advancing the program at this point."

This is not just a technology issue, however. This is a budget issue.

Let me quote the words of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] who opened this debate on the other side, from July 1 of last year. On the floor of

the House, he said, "We are sinking in debt. We have a real serious fiscal policy problem. Is part of the solution to cut spending? You had better believe it is. How do we cut spending? It is hard to do."

Similarly, my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], said on March 17 of this year, "To revitalize the economy, we need real substantial and sustained cuts in Government spending." The ALMR is a budget issue, because this is a program that does not measure up.

This amendment does not foreclose the nuclear option. I support the other five research programs that will be better uses of our money to advance nuclear science and protect our Nation's energy future. Again, my colleagues, let us reduce the deficit. Let us protect the environment. Let us bag the breeder.

Please vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleagues, Representatives COPPERSMITH, SHARP, and ZIMMER, to H.R. 2445, the energy and water appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. I believe that their amendment, to eliminate the modest funding that remains for the integral fast reactor, is irresponsible and shortsighted.

The \$21.9 million included in the energy and water appropriations bill for the IFR will allow the scientists of Argonne National Laboratories to test and prove the effectiveness of a technology to recycle spent nuclear fuel known as the actinide recycling. Funds to terminate the IFR are also included in the bill. But the administration and the Appropriations Committee realize the importance of allowing Argonne National Laboratories to test the fuel recycling program, the most important aspect of the IFR project, while it prepares for termination. We have a commitment to see this project through.

The actinide recycling technology offers a practical solution to the Nation's nuclear waste disposal problems. By employing this recycling process, the IFR burns radioactive byproducts, known as actinides, for fuel. Actinides are the radioactive, heavy metals in spent fuel rods that must be isolated from the air and water for thousands of years. The waste produced by this burning process remains radioactive for only a few hundred years, whereas nuclear waste generated by existing nuclear power plants is radioactive for thousands of years. The volume of waste is also reduced fourfold, making it far easier to manage than the spent rods of current nuclear plants.

Furthermore, by recycling actinides, the IFR has the amazing capacity to burn used fuel from existing plants and nuclear waste sites and can totally consume plutonium from dismantled nuclear weapons. Last Congress, we

made a commitment to test actinide recycling as a way to reduce nuclear waste in the omnibus energy bill of 1992. We should not back down on that commitment.

Mr. Chairman, the IFR, including the actinide recycling process, is a revolutionary technology that has the potential to offer the country a safe and lasting means of generating electricity while reducing the stockpile of existing nuclear waste and weapons-grade plutonium. The IFR addresses the public's concerns about the safety and security of nuclear power—it is far, far safer than the technology employed in current nuclear power plants. The IFR is inherently safe and will shut down automatically without human or mechanical intervention if the reactor should overheat. These safety features have been demonstrated in actual tests of a prototype reactor.

To those who contend that the IFR is a breeder reactor with the capacity to transform uranium into plutonium for nuclear weapons, I argue that the purpose of the IFR is exactly the opposite: the IFR burns plutonium and other actinides to generate power. Contrary to what opponents of the IFR say, the IFR does not produce pure plutonium. A highly sophisticated reprocessing technology would be needed to use the plutonium output for any other purpose than refueling the reactor itself.

Mr. Chairman, we should not cut funding for the IFR as it tests its most important feature—the actinide recycling process. As America pursues greater energy efficiency and as nuclear weapons are increasingly being dismantled, we cannot afford to abandon this vitally important program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 162, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

#### AYES—267

Ackerman	Blute	Coble
Allard	Boehlert	Collins (GA)
Andrews (ME)	Borski	Collins (IL)
Andrews (NJ)	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Andrews (TX)	Brewster	Condit
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Bachus (AL)	Brown (OH)	Cooper
Baesler	Bryant	Coppersmith
Ballenger	Bunning	Costello
Barca	Byrne	Cox
Barcia	Calvert	Coyne
Barlow	Cantwell	Cunningham
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Danner
Becerra	Castle	Darden
Beilenson	Clay	de Lugo (VI)
Berman	Clayton	Deal
Bishop	Clyburn	DeFazio



DeLauro	Klink	Reed	Grams	Manzullo	Rose
Dellums	Klug	Regula	Green	Matsui	Rostenkowski
Derrick	Kopetski	Reynolds	Gunderson	Mazzoli	Sangmeister
Deutsch	Kreidler	Richardson	Hancock	McCollum	Schaefer
Diaz-Balart	Kyl	Ridge	Hansen	McCrery	Schiff
Dickey	LaFalce	Roemer	Hastert	McDade	Shaw
Dicks	Lambert	Romero-Barcelo	Hayes	McHugh	Shuster
Dingell	Lancaster	(PR)	Hilliard	McKeon	Skelton
Dixon	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen	Hochbrueckner	McMillan	Smith (IA)
Dooley	Lazio	Roth	Horn	Meek	Smith (OR)
Doolittle	Lehman	Roukema	Houghton	Mica	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Levin	Rowland	Hoyer	Michel	Solomon
Dunn	Levy	Roybal-Allard	Huffington	Mineta	Spence
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Royce	Hunter	Molloy	Stokes
Edwards (TX)	Linder	Rush	Hutchinson	Montgomery	Strickland
English (AZ)	Lipinski	Sabo	Hyde	Moorhead	Stump
English (OK)	Long	Sanders	Inhofe	Murphy	Swift
Eshoo	Lowe	Santorum	Inslee	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
Evans	Machtley	Sarpalius	Istook	Myers	Tejeda
Farr	Maloney	Sawyer	Johnson (CT)	Natcher	Thomas (CA)
Fields (LA)	Mann	Saxton	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Thomas (WY)
Filner	Manton	Schenk	Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Thornton
Fingerhut	Margolies-	Schroeder	Klidae	Packard	Torres
Fish	Mezvinsky	Schumer	Kingston	Pastor	Torricelli
Flake	Markey	Scott	Knollenberg	Paxon	Traffant
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Sensenbrenner	Kolbe	Peterson (FL)	Valentine
Ford (TN)	McCandless	Serrano	LaRocco	Pickett	Visclosky
Fowler	McCloskey	Sharp	Laughlin	Pickle	Volkmer
Frank (MA)	McCurdy	Shays	Leach	Portno	Vucanovich
Frank (CT)	McDermott	Shepherd	Lewis (CA)	Porter	Walker
Furse	McHale	Sisisky	Lewis (FL)	Portman	Wilson
Gejdenson	McInnis	Skaggs	Lightfoot	Quinn	Wolf
Geren	McKinney	Slattery	Livingston	Roberts	Yates
Gilchrest	McNulty	Slaughter	Lloyd	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Meehan	Smith (MI)			
Gilman	Menendez	Smith (NJ)			
Glickman	Meyers	Snowe	Engel	Hinchey	Thompson
Goodlatte	Mfume	Spratt	Faleomavaega	Rogers	Tucker
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Stark	(AS)	Skeen	Whitten
Grandy	Miller (FL)	Stearns	Henry	Synar	
Greenwood	Minge	Stenholm			
Gutierrez	Mink	Studds			
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Stupak			
Hall (TX)	Molinar	Sundquist			
Hamburg	Moran	Swett			
Hamilton	Morella	Talent			
Harman	Nadler	Tanner			
Hastings	Neal (MA)	Tauzin			
Hefley	Neal (NC)	Taylor (MS)			
Hefner	Norton (DC)	Thurman			
Herger	Nussle	Torkildsen			
Hoagland	Oberstar	Towns			
Hobson	Obey	Underwood (GU)			
Hoekstra	Oliver	Unsoeld			
Hoke	Orton	Upton			
Holden	Owens	Velazquez			
Hughes	Pallone	Vento			
Hutto	Parker	Walsh			
Inglis	Payne (NJ)	Washington			
Jacobs	Payne (VA)	Waters			
Jefferson	Pelosi	Watt			
Johnson (GA)	Penny	Waxman			
Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)	Weldon			
Johnston	Petri	Wheat			
Kanjorski	Pomeroy	Williams			
Kaptur	Poshard	Wise			
Kasich	Price (NC)	Woolsey			
Kennedy	Pryce (OH)	Wyden			
Kennelly	Quillen	Wynn			
Kim	Rahall	Young (FL)			
King	Ramstad	Zeliff			
Klecza	Rangel	Zimmer			
Klein	Ravenel				

## NOES—162

Abercrombie	Brooks	Dreier
Applegate	Browder	Durbin
Archer	Brown (FL)	Emerson
Army	Burton	Everett
Baker (CA)	Buyer	Ewing
Baker (LA)	Callahan	Fawell
Barrett (NE)	Camp	Fazio
Bartlett	Canady	Fields (TX)
Barton	Carr	Foglietta
Bateman	Chapman	Franks (NJ)
Bentley	Clement	Frost
Bereuter	Clinger	Gallely
Bevill	Coleman	Gallo
Bilbray	Combest	Gekas
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gephardt
Blackwell	Crane	Gibbons
Bliley	Crapo	Gingrich
Boehner	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Bonilla	DeLay	Goodling
Bonior	Dornan	Goss

the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes in support of his amendment, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered will terminate spending on the SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor. I offer it on a broad bipartisan basis with our colleagues JIM RAMSTAD, TIM PENNY, RON MACHTLEY, RON WYDEN, SCOTT KLUG, PETE STARK, and WAYNE GILCHREST. This may seem like a large number of cosponsors, and it is. Which, I believe is an indication of the merits of this amendment, and the lack of merit of the SP-100.

Our amendment is quite simple. It puts into law President Clinton's budget request regarding the SP-100. It decreases by \$25 million the amount available in title III of the energy and water appropriations bill for the SP-100 space nuclear reactor and thermionics program. This program is allotted \$30 million in the committee report and our amendment would lower that amount to \$5 million for program termination purposes only, just as the administration has requested.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider the tightest budget that has come before Congress in many years, I say it is time to shoot down the SP-100 program. No one wants it, no one needs it, and no one can afford it. Anyone in this Chamber who, like me, wants to cut sky-high wasteful Federal spending should start right now, right here, and cut the SP-100.

The SP-100 nuclear satellite began in 1984 as a joint program of the Energy Department, the Defense Department and NASA to develop nuclear reactors for use in space. The Defense Department was then interested in a high-power nuclear reactor for use in the strategic defense initiative. And NASA was potentially interested in power sources for colonies on the Moon and Mars.

But when SDI was phased down, the Defense Department pulled out its support for the SP-100. And DOE has been trying to pull out for several years now because the SP-100 has absolutely no relevance whatsoever to domestic energy needs. And now NASA has formally shelved its current plans to colonize the Moon and Mars.

And it is not like this has been a model Federal program. According to the GAO, costs have quadrupled and the program is 13 years behind schedule. Over \$400 million has been spent to date and DOE has estimated that it would take at least another \$1.6 billion and 12 years just to complete construc-

## NOT VOTING—10

Engel	Hinchey	Thompson
Faleomavaega	Rogers	Tucker
(AS)	Skeen	Whitten
Henry	Synar	

## □ 1420

Mr. VALENTINE and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KASICH, Mr. LEVY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. HERGER, MORAN, and BACHUS of Alabama changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall No. 267. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

## □ 1420

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY: Page 20, line 9, strike \$3,192,634,000 and insert "\$3,167,634,000".

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], and all amendments thereto, be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto will be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] and

tion. That does not even begin to pay for flight testing and deployment.

This is why the Clinton administration has called for terminating the SP-100; in the statement of administration policy issued Tuesday by OMB they state: "Included in this [bill] is the SP-100 space reactor that will not likely be deployed by any Government agency or by private industry."

This is why the League of Conservation Voters, Friends of the Earth, and other environmental groups have said: The SP-100 is too risky to continue.

This is why the National Taxpayers Union and the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste have said: Stop throwing good money after bad.

But, unfortunately, the SP-100, like Rasputin, having been shot, poisoned, and strangled, refuses to die.

In a time of tough budget decisions, Mr. Chairman, this vote is easy. The SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor is unneeded, unwanted, expensive, and dangerous—it must not be continued.

For many of us this spring has been filled with many difficult budget choices. Because of our enormous Federal budget deficit, Members of Congress have been forced to decide whether or not to increase income taxes, whether or not to support an energy tax, to cut Medicare, to limit spending on other vital programs, to fund or to cut the space station and the superconductor. None of those decisions are easy. None of those decisions are fun.

Let me offer a stark contrast to those other budget votes. Let me offer the Markey-Ramstad amendment. This one isn't hard, this one is easy.

Our amendment will cut wasteful Federal spending for fiscal 1994 and future years by terminating spending of the SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor.

Before I review the record on the SP-100 I would like to commend the important investigatory work done on this program by our former colleague, Howard Wolpe of Michigan. When Howard was the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Science Committee he was tireless in getting to the bottom of all matters, such as the SP-100. He established a thorough record on the SP-100 and he offered an amendment to the fiscal 1993 energy and water appropriations bill. Although the Wolpe amendment failed narrowly last year, the record established by Howard has been enormously helpful in understanding this program.

This is what we now know about the SP-100:

First, the SP-100 has no mission: Not defense, not energy, not space.

Second, spending on it has been sky-high—it is three times over budget and 12 years late.

Third, it will take \$1.6 billion just to complete the construction phase of the program.

Fourth, the SP-100 reactor is potentially very dangerous.

Fifth, it has been abandoned by its lead sponsor agency, the Defense Department, and by its primary contractor, General Electric; and

Sixth, it is actively opposed by the administration, environmental groups, and taxpayer groups.

It would appear that the SP-100 is the Energizer bunny of the Federal budget. Despite its severe shortcomings, lack of a mission, inherent dangers and mismanagement, spending on this program goes on and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, quite simply, there is no reason on earth for the SP-100 satellite. Let us stop wasting taxpayers' money.

Even though we do not have enough money to spend on our space program or any other Federal programs, some would suggest that we have enough for the SP-100. They will suggest that with just a little more money, maybe just a year or two more spending, then they will finally have something to show. We have heard this before so many times about Federal spending, that so much as been invested already and just a little more will bring them to fruition.

Unfortunately, just the opposite is the case for the SP-100. Its supporters may list several potential future applications for it—if and when it ever gets off the ground. But the administration summed it all up when OMB stated just this week: "The SP-100 space reactor \*\*\* will not likely be deployed by any Government agency or by private industry."

If you still think that success for the SP-100 is just around the bend, take a look at this chart prepared by the General Accounting Office.

In 1986, the SP-100 was supposed to cost approximately \$500 million and be completed by 1991.

By June 1990, the project cost had begun to rise to \$800 million and its date of completion had begun to slip to 1995.

Unbelievably, from June 1990 to June 1991—the space of just one year—the project had slipped 7 years further behind and more than doubled in projected cost up to \$2 billion.

By February of last year, the estimated cost of the project had risen once again, to over \$2 billion—and slipped another 2 years further behind schedule; \$2.1 billion, still counting, and still climbing.

Even at that point—should we ever get there—all we will have for our money is a space nuclear reactor system that will not even have been flight tested. All at a cost of over \$2 billion—more than 4 times the original estimate.

The SP-100 space-based nuclear satellite should have been ended a long time ago. Let us end it today, before any more of the American taxpayers' money is wasted. Vote aye on the Markey-Ramstad-Penny-Machtley-Upton-

Klug-Stark-Gilchrest-Wyden amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this vote is easy.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 1993.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

\* \* \* \* \*

PRESIDENT'S INVESTMENT PROGRAM

\* \* \* \* \*

The Committee has added \$52 million for nuclear reactor programs that the Administration has proposed phasing out. Included in this is the SP-100 space reactor that will not likely be deployed by any government agency or by private industry.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE, SIERRA CLUB  
U.S. PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP, PUBLIC CITIZEN, ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, SAFE ENERGY COMMUNICATION COUNCIL, NUCLEAR INFORMATION & RESOURCE SERVICE,

June 23, 1993.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We urge you to support two important amendments to the Energy And Water Appropriations bill.

The Markey-Ramstad-Penny-Machtley amendment would terminate funding for the Energy Department's pork-barrel SP-100 space nuclear reactor program. This would save the taxpayers \$1.6 billion in coming years, and also help protect the environment. President Clinton proposed in his budget to terminate the program, but the Appropriations Committee is attempting to revive its funding. The amendment would cut the \$30 million provided by the Committee to the \$5 million requested by the President for shut-down costs only.

Since 1984, \$420 million has been sunk into this program to develop nuclear reactors for space applications, with little to show as a result. GAO reports that the program's costs have tripled, and that it is 13 years behind schedule. DOE previously tried to zero its contribution in 1989. Almost all of DOE's partners in the SP-100 program have tried to bail out. It's time for taxpayers to do the same.

The Federation of American Scientists has testified to Congress that "the SP-100 space reactor program is in serious trouble \*\*\* nearly ten years after its inception, it remains a technology without a mission." Originally intended to support activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) and NASA, the SP-100 now has no mission to support in either agency. DOD pulled out in 1991, complaining of high costs, delays and mismanagement by the Department of Energy (DOE). NASA has not given related program work more than \$10 million per year. The Office of Management and Budget's Statement of Administration Policy of June 22, 1993 said that the SP-100 "will not likely be deployed by any government agency or by private industry." In addition, there are potential environmental dangers from launching nuclear reactors in space or placing them in earth orbit. A failure during launch, or reentry into the atmosphere while in orbit, could spread radioactivity from the SP-100's highly enriched uranium fuel. Such environmental risks are unjustified given the lack of a clear mission for the program.

We also remind you to support the amendment by Reps. Coppersmith, Sharp and Zimmer that would eliminate funding for the Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor (ALMR) breeder program at the Department of Energy.



We would like to alert you that the League of Conservation Voters' political advisory committee will consider both of these votes in the process of compiling the 1993 National Environmental Scorecard at the end of this session.

Please support these two important amendments to eliminate these unneeded programs.

Sincerely,

RALPH DE GENNARO,  
Director, Appropriations Project,  
Friends of the Earth.

JILL LANCELOT,  
Director, Congressional Affairs,  
National Taxpayers Union.

On behalf of: Jim Maddy, Executive Director, League of Conservation Voters; Daniel A. Lashoff, Senior Scientist, Natural Resources Defense Council; Melanie Griffin, Washington Director, Economic Program, Sierra Club; Bill Magavern, Director, Critical Mass Energy Project, Public Citizen; Martin Gelfand, Research Director, Safe Energy Communication Council; Anna Aurilio, Staff Scientist, U.S. Public Interest Research Group; Tom Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Leon Lowery, Director, Energy Government Relations, Environmental Action; and Michael Mariotte, Executive Director, Nuclear Information & Resource Service.

SECRETARY OF ENERGY,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 1993.

Hon. EDWARD J. MARKEY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARKEY: The purpose of this letter is to express opposition to the recent action taken by the Committee on Appropriations, which provided an additional \$25 million for the Space Reactor Power Systems program in H.R. 2445, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill. We are opposed to this funding as the Administration has not identified a near-term application for the SP-100 and thermionics programs that justifies continued development at this time.

We would therefore support an amendment to delete the additional \$25 million from the bill.

Sincerely,

HAZEL R. O'LEARY.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confused here. I am not certain whether I am in the House of Representatives anymore or a convention of Luddites because it appears to me that anything that deals with R&D in this country at the present time is in jeopardy of being killed by the House of Representatives in their undertaking here today.

Let us talk about the SP-100. For one thing, my colleagues just bought a lot of bad information. It takes \$70 million to complete this project. It does not make \$2.1 billion. It is nowhere close. That is when the whole thing was to power up an entire SDI system. That obviously is no longer even in the calculation. This is a \$70 million program to completion.

I ask colleagues, "What do you get for that?" Is it unneeded? Well, what you get, all of you who thought yesterday when you came to the floor and said, "I am against space station, but I am for a great space program. What I want to do is go out with robotic probes."

□ 1430

This is what powers the robotic probes. When you go out and try to orbit a planet, you cannot do it with solar rays, because solar rays cannot give you enough battery power in deep space to give you the ability to orbit a planet.

The only way you can orbit a planet is to have a nuclear reactor on board. This is the reactor. This is what we are doing. We are trying to come up with the technology to allow us to do the deep space probe.

So if you voted against space station yesterday and you are going to vote against this program today, you are for no space program. You are for zilch, none. You are for wiping out the space program and closing down NASA.

I would suggest that that ought to be a fairly serious decision. Please, nobody come to the floor then and tell me how you are for a space program, it is just not space station. You are not for anything if you vote for both killing this program and space station.

It is also important to recognize that when you hear talk about air traffic control systems that can be used from outer space in the future, that would be much safer than anything we have, this is the power system for them.

When you talk about the large communications satellites that are going to be done in the future, this is the power plant for them. You cannot do solar power at above 15 kilowatts. This is a program that will produce a reactor at 20 to 40 kilowatts for \$70 million.

So you are really talking now about taking away from the future our ability to do commercial work in space and to do deep space probes if you take away this program. If we do, I will say again, I am not certain that we are any longer a Congress; we have become simply Luddites.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the distinguished colleague who just spoke, I do not feel that this is the end of our space program. Nor did I feel that not voting for the space station was the end of our space program.

This is a fiscal vote, one of responsibility. The SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor is a program that has no useful life, and now, because certain individuals want to see this program extended, they are trying to develop a useful life.

DOE does not want it; DOD does not want it; OMB does not want it. I think it is time we make it dead. There is not in fact a useful purpose for this program. It has been lost in space.

The American Federation of Scientists recently reported after a decade and nearly \$400 million, "It is still hard to predict when, if ever, the program might produce a useful reactor, and when, if ever, a reactor might be used."

More simply, we should spend our money on programs that we have a clear purpose for, perhaps it has a clear, identified goal, and perhaps which we will see completed in the next several years.

This program has gone on too long. It is much too dangerous economically and environmentally. It is time to end it.

Each of us are looking at ways to cut the deficit. If we put \$5 million in this budget, we can terminate this program. If we put an additional \$25 million, for a \$30 million program, it will continue its life unabated.

I would ask my colleagues to consider the economic importance of this program relative to the economic need to cut our deficit. I would ask Members to vote to support this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Markey amendment which would end funding for the SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor.

The goal of the SP-100 program is to develop a safe, compact, durable, lightweight, and high-performance reactor which could serve a wide range of space applications including solar exploration. Importantly, this is not technology without a mission. The SP-100 program can accomplish many missions including: NASA planetary exploration missions, large commercial communications satellites, air traffic control, and military surveillance.

Although we are in difficult budgetary times, I believe that it is important that we do not shortchange our future. The United States has been a leader in space-based technology. The SP-100 power system is necessary for future and more intricate space exploration to the outer planets, asteroids, and comets. We should be careful that in our zeal to reduce the deficit that we do not narrow our vision.

Contrary to the information which has been circulated about this program, first-generation technology developed by this program will be completed within 1½ years if it is funded. By the end of 1994, fully tested hardware will be available. If completed, the technology will provide a national capability of lasting value. Terminating the program at this time would mean a loss of the technology and a more costly restart in the future.

I believe the SP-100 is consistent with President Clinton's technology initiative. It promotes U.S. world leadership in basic science, mathematics, and engineering and it is investment in applied R&D. These are important objectives which must be accomplished if America is to remain competitive in the global economy.

Mr. Chairman, let us not waste the money we have put into this program. Let us put in the small amount that is necessary to give us these broad goals for the future, that will enable us to go out into outer space and do the things that we need to do to be involved in the commercial world. That is what these things are needed for.

We cannot afford to fall behind in research and development. We cannot afford to fall behind in the space program. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD], the cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Markey-Ramstad-Penny-Machtley-Upton-Wyden-Klug-Stark-Gilchrest amendment to terminate the SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor program.

First of all, I commend Mr. MARKEY's bipartisan effort to cut a wasteful spending program. Beyond the need to reduce the massive budget deficit and address important environmental concerns, what is most striking is the lack of support for this program.

In the early 1980's, the Departments of Defense, Energy, and NASA began a joint effort to develop the SP-100 Program. Reflecting changed priorities, and recognizing the growing cost estimates and schedule delays, the Department of Defense pulled out of the program 2 years ago. And this year, no money for the SP-100 Program was requested by the President.

So here we are, debating the appropriations bill for the Department of Energy—and you guessed it—DOE is also against funding the SP-100.

Could the message be any clearer?

How can we justify to our constituents funding a program that no agency of the Government wants?

This amendment takes the obvious step required and terminates the SP-100. The savings this year will be \$25 million. But more importantly, this amendment will save at least \$1.6 billion in coming years.

When faced with a \$4 trillion Federal debt, it is clear that we in this body must set priorities. Let us follow the lead of the Departments of Defense, Energy, NASA, and OMB and cut off funding now for this unneeded, unwanted, and wasteful program.

The amendment is strongly supported by the National Taxpayers

Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, as well as numerous environmental organizations.

Mr. Chairman, if Congress has trouble canceling this wasteful project, then I fear there is no hope that we can ever balance the budget.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that I am adamantly opposed to this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the committee.

□ 1440

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have to tell my colleagues, I almost tripped coming into the well here. There are bodies all over the place. There are Members strewn in bent positions, sticking their heads in the sand. This place is filled with ostriches. Members are closing their eyes to reality.

I heard the term "Luddites" used a little while ago, and I think it is very appropriate.

What in the world would Jack Kennedy say today, if he heard the gentleman from Massachusetts say, "Let's not have nuclear expansion into space, or let's not have nuclear propulsion units or nuclear generators in space, and ultimately, let us not go to space?"

Jack Kennedy, President of the United States, sent the first man to the Moon, and that is as far as we will ever go if the gentleman from Massachusetts has his way. "This program might as well be scrapped," he says. "Scrap the super collider. Scrap the space station. Let us all go back to our grass shacks and just forget about progress. We will all be better off living in the 18th century by Walden Pond."

Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely astounded at the narrow-minded approach of Members of Congress who want to stand here in the well and speak against progress for the United States of America and the rest of the world. We are the leaders of progress, and it is important that we faced up to it and continue to invest in the title we so well earned in the last 100 years.

If the Queen of Spain had said to Columbus, 500 years ago, "No, Columbus, I am sorry, we all know the world is flat; don't take the ships. I can't spare the ships; they are going to fall off the end of the world, and it is a foolish mission," then she would have had the same attitude as the Members who promote this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding time to me.

Let me make it clear that I have three little boys at home. One of the reasons I voted for the space station yesterday is because I think a vision in space is still very important to this country's future. My three little boys are also big fans of the Muppets. There used to be a running Muppet Show called "Pigs in Space," with Miss Piggy.

I would now like to welcome my colleagues to the real-life version of "Pigs in Space," because this is a pig in space.

Only one nuclear reactor has ever been launched by the U.S. Government into space, and it was done back on April 3, 1965. And then the program was terminated, because there was no definable mission.

We went back to the idea of a nuclear reactor in space because of the needs of the SDI, but SDI, as we all know, is dead. We have already spent \$416 million in joint funding since 1986 on a program which today has absolutely no definable mission.

Now, we have kicked around numbers a lot, but in the spring of 1992, the Defense Department, the Energy Department, and NASA tried to put a final price tag on what it would take to complete this program and finally get a nuclear reactor into space. If the first launch was in the year 2000, the price tag would be somewhere between \$750 and \$825 million.

My colleague from Louisiana is right in the sense that we may need at some point to consider nuclear power and research for outer space, and that is exactly what the Department of Defense is doing in the TOPAZ Program.

The TOPAZ Program, to refresh my colleagues, is a Soviet nuclear reactor that we bought in 1992. The Air Force now says that it may cost as little as \$70 million, one-tenth the cost of the SP project, to get a nuclear reactor into space. So we can have the best of both worlds. We can cancel a project that has no definable mission and trade it in on a Soviet reactor at just one-tenth of the cost.

One final point, Mr. Chairman. A lot of times I think we can gauge what we are doing in government by what is happening in the private sector. In September 1992, General Electric, the prime contractor for the SP-100, put its Space Power business up for sale. According to trade publications, as of today there is not a single buyer for the system.

In early 1992, Rockwell International and Space Power entered into negotiations with DOE to do research and work on reactors other than the SP-100 program.



Mr. Chairman, I do support space research. I, however, do not support this particular program.

I urge the adoption of the Markey amendment, because I think it makes good sense. It is time to bring this pig in space back down to Earth.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to put into perspective what the gentleman just mentioned about the TOPAZ project. In order to do the TOPAZ project at the cost the gentleman referred to, we would have to fly the Soviet reactor as is. The Soviet reactor as is does not have the kind of safety devices on it that we could even put aboard our spacecraft.

And so the gentleman is talking about flying a Soviet reactor with safeguards totally eliminated, the kinds of things that we would not do. To put a nuclear reactor into space with the Soviet technology would not be something that we could possibly do.

If we want to make the Soviet reactor comply with our safety standards, it costs as much, if not more, than completing the SP-100.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, on one of the rather famous episodes of "Pigs in Space," Miss Piggy was given the opportunity to choose between the meaning and purpose of life or swill Stroganoff. And tragically, she made the choice of swill Stroganoff.

It seems to me that we are maybe not going to quite have the opportunity to discover the meaning and purpose of life, but I believe, as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] does, that this amendment should be defeated.

Why? Because as one looks at the Preamble of the Constitution, something else that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] mentioned about the SP-100 is that we are going to have tremendous developments in the area of military surveillance. I see this as constitutionally a national security issue.

I can sympathize with my friends and I am one who, too, is concerned about budgetary matters. But clearly, as we recognize that this is a global economy, it would be a very, very bad step for us to move backward rather than forward as we deal with this challenge.

Let us not choose swill Stroganoff. Let us move closer and closer to the meaning and purpose of life.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I would have chosen myself the meaning and purpose of life, if I had watched the program "Miss Piggy Flies

in Space." I think that is what we are doing here. This is a perfect reflection, in my estimation, of a bipartisan debate about what is right and what is wrong, maybe not even what is right and what is wrong, but taking the limited resources that we have and prioritizing the best programs that will benefit as a Nation and as we fit together with the rest of the world and, yes, even on into the next frontier, which is space.

So we do have to be concerned about the budget and how much money we have to spend, and we do not have all the money we need. Any maybe if we did, maybe we could spend the surplus which we do not have on a program like this that NASA has not requested, the Pentagon does not want, and there is no commercial value for this particular type of technology.

Let us be concerned about national security, as we are, and the limited resources that we have to spend on it. Let us be concerned about the budget. I request my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

This amendment is to delete \$25 million for the SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor. We have practical, fiscal, and environmental reasons to terminate this project. Circumstances that justified this project have changed. The SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor is an idea whose time has come and gone.

When the SP-100 was begun in the 1980's, it was intended to provide a power source for a space-based missile defense system. This mission is no longer needed.

The Department of Defense, NASA, and the Department of Energy were partners on SP-100. Today, neither NASA nor DOD want this project. The Department of Energy is left holding the bag.

A March 1992 report by the Office of Management and Budget indicated that SP-100 was troubled with cost overruns, had no civilian purpose, and might not work. An additional \$1.6 billion is the estimated cost of completion. Over \$400 million has been spent to date.

Mr. Chairman, one could, in watching this debate, reach the conclusion that our Government is running a massive surplus, and that we are desperately looking for programs to fund. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If we continue funds for SP-100, we are funding a NASA project which NASA didn't request, a defense project that the Pentagon can't use, a science project with no commercial application, and a Department of Energy project which will provide no significant help in meeting our energy needs.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, it is rare that the Sierra Club and the National Taxpayers Union agree on something. This project makes no sense from an environmental standpoint, from a fiscal standpoint, or even from a technology standpoint, as it diverts funds from other projects. Let's listen to the taxpayer groups, the environmental groups, the GAO, OMB, and the Department of Energy. I urge

my colleagues to vote to terminate this program.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts to kill the SP-100 Program.

Mr. Chairman, the SP-100 Program is a ground research program that focuses on the development of components and technology that could be used for a future space demonstration of space power. The program is being managed by the Department of Energy and co-funded by NASA, and consists of the development of a small, advanced, space qualified reactor power system that can be utilized for many space applications including exploration of our solar system.

The current phase of the SP-100 Program was initiated in 1985 and is now within a year-and-a-half of completing a system that will be capable of meeting several near-term NASA mission objectives.

To date, approximately \$450 million have been spent for development of the SP-100 Program. By the end of fiscal year 1994 fully tested hardware will be available.

Mr. Chairman, terminating this program prematurely would mean a very cost-ineffective restart in the future.

In addition, the program has made excellent technical progress under very difficult start/stop funding and also has been designed with safety as its primary concern.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, although there are no current missions for the SP-100 Program, there are a number of future civil and defense missions that will require this program. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory planners are evaluating an early mission using SP-100 to map the particle and radiation fields of the Van Allen belts. Other agencies also are evaluating the SP-100 for future deep space missions. Very simply, we will need the nuclear power for these missions.

I would ask my colleagues not to throw away the \$450 million investment that already has been made in this project. The funding in this bill will allow the SP-100 Program to be documented and put on the shelf. No one is asking for the \$1 billion demonstration as is asserted by the authors of the amendment. It is apparent in these tight budget times that we cannot afford this expense.

But we also cannot afford the expense and waste that would result if the SP-100 Program is terminated.

I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman has the right to close.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am shocked today at the direction, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has already said, that this House is going. It seems that we do not realize that in less than 7 short years we are going to move into the 21st century. But if we continue today, as we are, we will be walking into the 21st century with a horse and buggy and with a candle, because we just seem to be completely ignoring research that will be able to make us competitive with the rest of the world.

Now, to talk about this SP-100, it has been before our committee for a number of years. I must say that the Department of Energy never has been too excited about it. But up until this year, the Department of Defense and NASA have been. For some reason, just this year, both of those agencies have lost interest in it.

□ 1450

When we look at what the possibilities are for the SP-100 as it is developed, we see that, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] also said, NASA will be going into planetary exploration in the future, and today we will not have the onboard power if we do not have this type of SP-100 vehicle to power those planetary explorations.

There is expected to be a large commercial use as far as commercial communications satellites. There may be other commercial uses for this particular power plant. Air traffic controllers all over the world are envisioning some time in the future they are going to need satellites in the atmosphere to be able to navigate and direct air traffic. How are we going to power them when they get behind the Sun if we do not have this type of reactor?

Mr. Chairman, it seems that we are swept up today in a frenzy, the anti-nuclear sentiment. This group, put together with a handful of people here who want to blindly save money, are misdirected today.

If we do this we are not saving \$25 million, as the proponents suggest we will not be spending \$25 million, but we will be wasting half a billion dollars through the years that DOD, DOE, and NASA have spent on the development of this.

We have hardware today ready to be put in place to start developing what we have been talking about, the various types of satellites that can use this type of powerplant. It would not be saving money, we will be wasting the half a billion dollars we have already spent.

Earlier we talked about Clinch River, on an earlier amendment. Yes, we wasted about \$2.5 billion on Clinch River. If we started itemizing all the things where Congress has spent money and then changed their mind, we would be here all afternoon. This is some-

thing, there is no question in my mind, there are going to be future needs for our country if we are to move in and be competitive with the rest of the world in the 21st century. This is one of the powerplants where we have so much invested, and we have such a small amount to go here. After this year's appropriations are expended, we will have a workable approach and solve some of the problems with less than \$50 million. It would be a terrible mistake to not continue this program this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the SP-100 is a technology without an identifiable mission. Begun in 1984 as a joint Department of Energy-Department of Defense-NASA program to develop nuclear reactors for use in space, this program was initially envisioned to meet the needs of the strategic defense initiative [SDI]. DOD is no longer interested and no firm mission has been identified that will use an SP-100 space reactor by either NASA or DOD.

Over \$400 million has been spent to date. DOE has estimated that it would take \$1.6 billion and 12 years to complete the current phase of the program. According to the General Accounting Office, projected costs have tripled and the program is 13 years behind schedule.

It makes absolutely no sense to spend \$30 million a year on a program that will cost \$2 billion to complete. We are throwing good money after bad. In the current fiscal environment, we cannot afford such waste.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the Markey amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the final minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that has no mission: not defense, not energy, not space. Future rockets will be powered by radioisotope thermal generators. It is the technology of preference by NASA. The other agencies will no longer have any use for this technology.

Spending has been sky-high. It has already doubled. It is going to double again over existing projections. The project is 12 years behind schedule already. There is absolutely no justification for taking a program which has not worked and has no constituency to continue.

If we cannot cut this program, then I do not think there is a program in the House that it is possible for us to in fact cut. The National Taxpayers Union and environmental groups join

on this issue. It has to end. There is no earthly reason why we should continue to fund a program to put the SP-100 in the heavens. We have to end it.

This is the time, this is the place. Let us show that we have the will to make the easy decisions, because the tough decisions coming down the line are going to be much, much more difficult if we punt on this kind of an issue. It is bipartisan. Please support the Markey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 333, noes 98, not voting 8, as follows:

(Roll No. 268)

## AYES—333

Ackerman	Danner	Gutierrez
Allard	Darden	Hall (OH)
Andrews (ME)	de Lugo (VI)	Hamburg
Andrews (NJ)	Deal	Hamilton
Andrews (TX)	DeFazio	Hancock
Applegate	DeLauro	Harman
Baessler	Dellums	Hastert
Baker (LA)	Derrick	Hefley
Ballenger	Deutsch	Hefner
Barca	Dickey	Hergert
Barcia	Dicks	Hoagland
Barlow	Dingell	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Dixon	Hochbrueckner
Barrett (WI)	Dooley	Hoekstra
Becerra	Doolittle	Hoke
Beilenson	Duncan	Holden
Berman	Dunn	Houghton
Bilbray	Durbin	Hoyer
Bishop	Edwards (CA)	Huffington
Blackwell	Edwards (TX)	Hughes
Blute	Emerson	Hutchinson
Boehlert	English (AZ)	Hutto
Bonior	English (OK)	Inglis
Borski	Eshoo	Inhofe
Boucher	Evans	Istook
Brewster	Ewing	Jacobs
Brown (OH)	Farr	Jefferson
Bryant	Fawell	Johnson (CT)
Bunning	Fazio	Johnson (GA)
Burton	Fields (LA)	Johnson (SD)
Buyer	Filner	Johnson, Sam
Byrne	Fingerhut	Johnston
Calvert	Fish	Kanjorski
Camp	Flake	Kaptur
Canady	Foglietta	Kasich
Cantwell	Ford (MI)	Kennedy
Cardin	Ford (TN)	Kennelly
Carr	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Castle	Franks (CT)	Kim
Clay	Furse	Kingston
Clayton	Gallegly	Klecza
Clement	Gejdenson	Klein
Clinger	Gekas	Klink
Clyburn	Gephardt	Klug
Coble	Geren	Knollenberg
Collins (GA)	Gibbons	Kolbe
Collins (IL)	Gilchrest	Kopetski
Collins (MI)	Gillmor	Kreidler
Condit	Gilman	LaFalce
Conyers	Glickman	Lambert
Cooper	Goodlatte	Lancaster
Coppersmith	Goodling	Lantos
Costello	Gordon	LaRocco
Cox	Goss	Laughlin
Coyne	Grandy	Lazio
Crane	Greenwood	Leach
Cunningham	Gundersen	Lehman



Levin	Parker	Sharp
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Shays
Linder	Paxon	Shepherd
Lipinski	Payne (NJ)	Sisisky
Lloyd	Payne (VA)	Skaggs
Long	Pelosi	Skelton
Lowe	Penny	Slattery
Machtley	Peterson (FL)	Slaughter
Maloney	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Mann	Petri	Snowe
Manton	Pickle	Spratt
Manzullo	Pombo	Stark
Margolies-	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Mezvinsky	Porter	Stokes
Markey	Portman	Strickland
Martinez	Poshard	Studds
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stupak
Mazzoli	Pryce (OH)	Sundquist
McCandless	Quillen	Swett
McCloskey	Quinn	Swift
McCrery	Rahall	Talent
McCurdy	Ramstad	Tanner
McDermott	Rangel	Tauzin
McHale	Ravenel	Taylor (MS)
McHugh	Reed	Taylor (NC)
McInnis	Regula	Tejeda
McKinney	Reynolds	Thomas (WY)
McMillan	Richardson	Thurman
McNulty	Ridge	Torkildsen
Meehan	Roberts	Towns
Menendez	Roemer	Underwood (GU)
Meyers	Rohrabacher	Upton
Mfume	Romero-Barcelo	Valentine
Miller (CA)	(PR)	Velazquez
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Vento
Minge	Rostenkowski	Visclosky
Mink	Roth	Volkmer
Moakley	Roukema	Vucanovich
Molinari	Rowland	Walsh
Montgomery	Roybal-Allard	Washington
Moran	Royce	Waters
Morella	Rush	Watt
Murphy	Sabo	Waxman
Nadler	Sanders	Wheat
Neal (MA)	Sangmeister	Williams
Neal (NC)	Santorium	Wise
Norton (DC)	Sarpaluis	Wolf
Nussle	Sawyer	Woolsey
Oberstar	Saxton	Wyden
Obey	Schaefer	Wynn
Oliver	Schroeder	Yates
Ortiz	Schumer	Young (AK)
Orton	Scott	Zeliff
Owens	Sensenbrenner	Zimmer
Pallone	Serrano	

## NOES—98

Abercrombie	Fowler	Moorhead
Archer	Frank (NJ)	Murtha
Armey	Frost	Myers
Bacchus (FL)	Gallo	Natcher
Bachus (AL)	Gingrich	Oxley
Baker (CA)	Gonzalez	Packard
Bartlett	Grams	Pickett
Barton	Green	Rogers
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Rose
Bentley	Hansen	Schenk
Bereuter	Hastings	Schiff
Bevill	Hayes	Shaw
Bilirakis	Hilliard	Shuster
Billey	Horn	Smith (IA)
Boehner	Hunter	Smith (MI)
Bonilla	Hyde	Smith (OR)
Brooks	Inslee	Smith (TX)
Browder	Johnson, E.B.	Solomon
Brown (CA)	King	Spence
Brown (FL)	Kyl	Stearns
Callahan	Levy	Stump
Chapman	Lewis (CA)	Thomas (CA)
Coleman	Lewis (FL)	Thornton
Combest	Lightfoot	Torres
Cramer	Livingston	Torricelli
Crapo	McCollum	Trafficant
de la Garza	McDade	Unsoeld
DeLay	McKeon	Walker
Diaz-Balart	Meek	Weldon
Dornan	Mica	Whitten
Dreier	Michel	Wilson
Everett	Mineta	Young (FL)
Fields (TX)	Mollohan	

## NOT VOTING—8

Engel	Henry	Synar
Faleomavaega	Hinchey	Thompson
(AS)	Skeen	Tucker

□ 1516

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Tucker for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CUNNINGHAM, PETERSON of Florida, ROSTENKOWSKI, TEJEDA, and CANADY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 20, line 10, before the period insert the following: "of which \$10,000,000 shall be for hydrogen research and development"

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I hope this will be a noncontroversial amendment. It adds no money, but it is designed to permit us to do a research and development program in hydrogen which I think is absolutely essential for the future of the country.

It allows us to do clean fuels and clean energy for the future. So what we are doing is assigning up to \$10 million for that purpose.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, we agree to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MEYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the author has discussed this with the committee, with all of us. He has been a long proponent of the use of hydrogen energy. We support it, and we thank him for the offer.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to use this time to express my thanks to the chairman and the ranking member and to point out that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] frequently, with my co-operation, has pursued this line of research for a number of years. We think it is very important, and we appreciate the help he has given us.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the dis-

tinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 48 hours we have witnessed a carefully orchestrated campaign to leak charges of questionable costs incurred by DOE contractors at the SSC. Opponents of the SSC want to divert attention from the merits of the project by claiming impropriety on the part of DOE's contractors with regard to reimbursements of costs incurred as part of their contracts. They hope to divert the attention of Members from the merits of the project.

I would like to ask a series of questions about this issue so we can put the matter to rest, because I want the Members to judge the matter of the super collider on its merits and not on any false allegations of impropriety.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Department of Energy Inspector General is currently conducting a review of this contract.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, that is true.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Has the Inspector General issued its report?

Mr. BROWN of California. No. The report has not yet been issued.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In that case, we are talking about preliminary findings in a report that was prematurely released?

Mr. BROWN of California. That is correct.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, is it the gentleman's understanding that this contract, which is cost-reimbursable contract, is in strict accordance with Department of Energy contracting policies for such contracts?

Mr. BROWN of California. That is my understanding of the situation, yes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So what we are talking about here are contracting practices that are used throughout all Department of Energy facilities for such cost-reimbursable contracts?

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Is it not true that these expenses are legal and allowable under the terms of Department of Energy contracting practices and that in fact the Department of Energy approved these expenditures?

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman is absolutely correct on that.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that all Members understand that there is no illegality or wrongdoing here and that these are contracting practices that exist for all Department of Energy contracts in all national laboratories.

Now, if the Department of Energy or the Congress want to change these practices, let us develop a policy that

will apply to all Department of Energy contracts and not single out this project. Let us debate the science, the cost, and the benefits of the project; let us not get sidetracked on false allegations of improprieties.

Mr. BROWN of California. Let me add that in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology we have a very aggressive oversight program on this, conducted in the past Congress by the chairman of the oversight committee, Mr. WOLPE, who is an opponent of the project. And while he uncovered a number of things which he did not like, it is my own view that none of the practices that have been observed and reported constitute illegal actions, although in some cases I disagree with what they have been doing.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of title III is as follows:

#### URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the uranium program, including payment to the Tennessee Valley Authority under the settlement agreement filed with the United States Claims Court on December 18, 1987, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out uranium enrichment facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions and other activities of Title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and Title X, Subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, \$286,320,000 to be derived from the fund, to remain available until expended; and in addition, \$49,679,000 in unexpended balances, consisting of \$6,267,000 of unobligated balances and \$43,412,000 of obligated balances, are transferred from the Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities account, to be available for such expenses.

#### GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary for general science and research activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 15 for replacement only), \$1,594,114,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no funds may be obligated for construction of a B-factory until completion, by October 31, 1993, of a technical review of the Cornell and Stanford linear accelerator proposals by the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425,

as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$260,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. To the extent that balances in the fund are not sufficient to cover amounts available for obligation in the account, the Secretary shall exercise her authority pursuant to section 302(e)(5) of said Act to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated, within available funds, not to exceed \$5,500,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada, for the sole purpose in the conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97-425, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated, not more than \$7,000,000 may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in the Act, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act.

#### ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FUND

For Department of Energy expenses for isotope production and distribution activities, \$3,910,000, to remain available until expended.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

##### WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.) including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansions; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 109 for replacement only, including one police-type vehicle), and the purchase of one rotary-wing aircraft, \$3,572,472,000, to remain available until expended.

#### DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental restoration and waste management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansions; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 125 of which 122 are for replacement only including 9 police-type vehicles), \$5,185,877,000, to remain available until expended.

#### MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense materials support, and other defense activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 45 for replacement only), \$2,046,592,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the New Pro-

duction Reactor Appropriation Account shall be merged with and the balances made available to this appropriation.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$120,000,000, to remain available until expended, all of which shall be used in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Nuclear Waste Fund appropriation of the Department of Energy contained in this title.

#### DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for Departmental Administration and other activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$35,000), \$401,238,000 to remain available until expended, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511, et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department of miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$239,209,000 in fiscal year 1994 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during fiscal year 1994 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$162,029,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$31,757,000, to remain available until expended.

#### POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of projects in Alaska and of marketing electric power and energy, \$4,010,000, to remain available until expended.

#### BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$3,000.

During fiscal year 1994, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$29,742,000, to remain available until expended.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE,

#### SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities



and of marketing electric power and energy, and for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$33,587,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, not to exceed \$5,583,000 in reimbursements, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, the purchase, maintenance, and operation of one fixed-wing aircraft for replacement only, \$287,956,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$275,400,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation fund; in addition, \$5,000,000 is appropriated for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration \$7,168,000, to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104(a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101, et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles; official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$3,000); \$165,375,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter and notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$165,375,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 1994, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTON of Texas: Page 21, line 22, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, that none of the funds made available under this section for Department of Energy facilities may be obligated or expended for food, beverages, receptions, parties, country club fees, plants or flowers pursuant to any cost-reimbursable contract."

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this will take 5 minutes. This is in response to the colloquy that we just had with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

There have been a number of concerns raised about the superconducting super collider and the discretionary account that the laboratory director has. He has used that account for some Christmas parties, some plants, and things of this sort. That is totally legal within the contract; it is legal within the Department of Energy practices. But because some Members have expressed concern, I have checked with the laboratory and they have absolutely no problem to my offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do offer the amendment. It would say that not only at the superconducting super collider, but all Department of Energy facilities, none of the nonreimbursable contract money can be used for those purposes.

I would support that this will save some money, it will certainly send a signal that we are going to be more tight-fisted. I would hope that we could accept this by unanimous consent, or at least by voice vote, and get on with the business at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DANNER

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DANNER: Page 23, line 14, strike "\$3,572,472,000" and insert "\$3,572,198,000".

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your consideration and the opportunity to offer this amendment.

The amendment I offer today is the first step toward eliminating an outdated and costly program that exists, in the words of the Department of Energy, solely to answer the question "What if?"

The program, known as Safeguard C, was instituted in 1963 as a part of the Limited Test Ban Treaty and exists just in case the United States resumes atmospheric or other prohibited nuclear testing. The Departments of Energy and Defense are spending millions of dollars, as much as \$20 million per year, on the admittedly remote chance that we may decide to resurrect the insane practice of detonating nuclear bombs in the atmosphere, the ocean, or above ground.

This program has outlived its usefulness—we have learned the painful results of atmospheric testing: radioactive snow in the South Pacific that poisoned thousands in the 1940's and 1950's, and did untold damage to our environment. We know that such tests

will never be resumed and therefore that Safeguard C is not necessary.

Although it only cuts \$274,000 from the Department of Energy, this amendment is the necessary first step if we are to be serious, and taken seriously, about cutting spending and eliminating needless programs.

I intend to take the next step, the elimination of all Safeguard C funding in the Department of Defense authorization and appropriations bills.

Today, Mr. Chairman, let us take the first step to stop spending money on expensive, rhetorical, useless questions like "What if?"

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DANNER. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendment, and we have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SLATTERY

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY: Page 21, line 16, strike "\$1,594,114,000" and insert "\$1,194,114,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 203, the amendment is not subject to amendment or to a demand for division of the question.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Does any Member seek recognition in opposition?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before we commence the debate on the superconducting super collider this afternoon, I want to pay tribute to my friend from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], who has worked tirelessly with me on this effort.

I also recognize a former Member of this body, the gentleman from Ohio, Dennis Eckert, who also worked tirelessly in previous years in attempting to terminate the super collider.

Mr. Chairman, science has served our Nation well. It has made us the economic leader we are today. We have a responsibility to ensure that we will

have scientists and engineers capable of meeting the challenges of the next century. It is for this reason I strongly support continued, increased funding for our Nation's broadly based scientific research programs.

But I must strongly oppose continued funding for the super collider, and I do so for the following reasons, and I ask my colleagues to listen carefully to these reasons:

First of all, let us look at the cost. Under all the technological jargon and scientific hype, the debate on the super collider comes down to a very simple question: What does it cost, and what are the benefits?

This vote, in one word, is about money, and a lot of it. If we did not have a \$300 billion deficit, my friends, we would not have to be so concerned about these kinds of issues, I suppose. But we do, and we must.

The cost of the super collider has grown from \$4.4 billion in 1987, with a \$2.9 billion Federal contribution, to over \$11 billion today, with over a \$10 billion Federal contribution. That is a threefold increase in the Federal contribution to this project.

Second, the SSC will drain funding from other, urgent science projects. Let there be no doubt about it, and do not take my word for it, take the word of the Congressional Budget Office, take the word of the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and rely a little bit on common sense.

Point No. 3: When we embarked on this great endeavor, we are promised that the administration would find \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions. Well, my friends, as we stand here today, more than 3 years after these promises were made, what do we have in the bank? The best I can find is that we have approximately \$53 million promised from the Russian Federation and \$7.1 million from the People's Republic of China.

□ 1530

That is nowhere near the \$1.7 billion that was promised.

As we talk about this cost question, I want also to draw the attention of my colleagues to the good debate that we had on this issue last year. If you want to reference it, it was June 17, 1992, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page H4807. Let me read to you some of the comments by the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. He asked the rhetorical question: "Can we afford the super collider?"

This is the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 1 year ago in the well of this House. And what did he say? He said:

Mr. Chairman, after studying this issue closely, my conclusion is "no—not by ourselves." This Nation no longer has the resources to go it alone on big science projects.

The chairman continued by saying:

It has long been apparent that the Federal Government cannot afford to pay the full \$8.2 billion cost of the SSC by itself.

That was last year, my friends. Now it is \$10 billion, if not \$11 billion.

And listen to what he then said, and this is very important. He said:

To do so would require massive reductions in other critical science programs, including other high-energy physics program.

That is the chairman, my friends, of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Let me further point out that the American Physical Society endorsed this project conditioned upon it not draining funds from other projects.

I cannot help but wonder, my friends, if they have read what the chairman of the committee has told us in this well a year ago.

Now, another point. The General Accounting Office testified last month, May 26, 1993, that the super collider is behind schedule and over budget and does not yet have in place an adequate cost control system. That is not me dreaming this up. That is the General Accounting Office.

Here is the report. If you want to read it, I will have it at the desk.

Earlier this year the General Accounting Office came to similar conclusions when they reported in February 1993.

Now, in addition to that, there have been investigations by the General Accounting Office and the inspector general of the Department of Energy, and they have looked at the question of how our tax dollars have been spent on this project.

It has already been pointed out in the debate that the inspector general's report that was released prematurely in the last few days, is a tentative finding and recommendation. In all fairness, these are tentative findings, but they are worthy of note.

And listen, please. They concluded:

There was a pattern of unreasonable cost that went unchallenged and cost growth that was not adequately dealt with. We concluded that \$216 million, or about 40 percent of the \$508 million in subcontractor expenditures we examined were unreasonable because they were unnecessary, excessive or represented uncontrolled cost growth.

Now, my friends, granted this is a premature report. They want to look at it again, but I do not think it should be ignored.

Indeed, it is fair for us in this body to consider the best evidence available as we make these decisions, and this is some of the best evidence available.

Let us move on. For those who are tempted to vote for the super collider because of a few jobs in your districts, and I know a number of my colleagues have said, "I would vote for your amendment, Jim, I agree with you, but I have a few jobs in my district that I am concerned about."

Well, let me just draw this to your attention. Please consider how much it is going to cost your respective States to pay for this project. Kansas is going to get a few hundred thousand dollars.

But do you know what it is going to cost Kansas in taxes to pay for this project? It will cost \$103 million.

What is it going to cost California? \$1.449 billion.

The State of New York, \$940 million.

The State of Massachusetts, \$312 million.

So please keep in mind the cost per State for this project, and if you want to know what it is going to cost your state, we have the whole list right here, put together by the Tax Foundation, not by my office.

The last point that I would like to make before we move on in the debate is that these are the simple, hard, irrefutable facts. We cannot ignore this information any longer. In my judgment, this simple, irrefutable evidence demands a basic verdict right now, a verdict against the super collider.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will do what we did last year when this body voted 232 to 181 to kill the super collider. Let us do it again this evening with a bigger vote and send an even stronger message to the body across the rotunda.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding this time to me.

I must say that my friends on both sides of the aisle may want to hear that last year I voted against the superconducting super collider. I did so for many of the same kinds of questions and concerns expressed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] again today.

Then I was encouraged by my colleagues from Texas to travel down and visit the superconducting super collider and examine carefully where the SSC was going.

Frankly, I do not pretend to be a scientist, but sometimes you have to put things in very simple terms so folks like me can understand them.

A constituent of mine in California is the beneficiary of the kind of research that is a direct spinoff of this project. Let me describe it to you. Loma Linda University, working with the Fermi Lab in Illinois, went through an experi-



ment that led to the development of a small proton accelerator in a building that is some five stories tall. That facility is a synchrotron which ships protons out of hydrogen gas and accelerates them around a go-foot ring of powerful magnets. It is a great recipient of high concentration of radiation. You can then rifle that beam at cancer tissue and it does not have the flash point on the other side, so the tissue on the other side does not die as with the most often used radiation treatment.

A woman in my district, the beneficiary of this treatment, had been told by three different centers that she was going to lose her eye because of a tumor behind it. Using the proton beam, they treated her and the tumor was removed. She did not have to have the eye removed from her head.

In the meantime, she is living a healthy and happy life. That kind of spinoff from this sort of technique has phenomenal results that will make a difference that is worth a lot of money to all the States in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to think long and hard about America's continued leadership in science. The SSC is one of the areas that will allow us to continue that leadership.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, who is sponsoring the amendment to strike the superconducting super collider, cited remarks that I had made in the past with regard to the superconducting super collider, and I think in every case he quoted me correctly.

I voted for the superconducting super collider. I have consistently over the years, but I have also said, because my concern fundamentally is for the health of the scientific establishment of this country, that it would be unwise to continue funding the superconducting super collider if it was actually taking funds from smaller science projects within the Department of Energy or from any other source.

□ 1540

I have said, and, as a matter of fact I am on record in this House as having said, and our committee is on record as having said, that to complete this project we need a major international partner. The bill which we reported from our committee and which this House passed called for authorizing the program, but with a 20-percent foreign contribution, which has never been achieved.

Now that is the situation that faces us in this imperfect world. I do not want the lack of foreign participation

to force us to make expenditures which will draw money from other research.

I wrote to the Secretary of Energy over a year ago and said, "My support for the continuation of this project depends upon protecting the small science projects which you are funding in the Department of Energy." I still feel that way. I think we cannot afford to starve one section of science in order to support another section.

Now why is it that we are unable to get firm commitments for the full amount of the foreign participation that we need? One reason is that foreign partners do not believe we are serious about doing this project, and they justify that position by pointing to the fact that the House of Representatives killed this project last year.

The point that I am trying to make here is that we bear a responsibility not only for the additional cost, by stretching this out for another 2 or 3 years we have added another couple of billion dollars, but by not knowing whether we want to go ahead means that foreign partners are not enthusiastic about participating in this. I have come to the position that we have got to show resolve; we have got to demonstrate that we are committed to finishing this project. We have got to keep the heat on the Department of Energy not to starve other science projects, and we intend to do that in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has long been a world leader in high energy physics, a field of research that delves into the nature of the elements that make up the universe around us, and seeks to rationalize the complex forces and particles that comprise all matter. To continue our leadership in the field we must move on to the next generation of particle accelerator—the basic research tool of the high energy physicist. We must build the superconducting collider.

Today, however, some of our colleagues would have us believe that we can no longer afford to pursue this type of fundamental scientific inquiry. If that is true, it will be a sad day for this country.

This view is not endorsed by the administration. The President has requested \$640 million in his budget for the super collider, and he continues to support the project.

Nor is this view endorsed by the National Academy of Sciences. The Academy has just released a report entitled, "Science, Technology, and the Federal Government." In that report the Academy unequivocally maintains that, "The United States should be among the world leaders in all major areas of science." This means, the report continues, "That the United States should have capabilities and infrastructures of support that are not exceeded elsewhere."

Why do we need to be among the world leaders in all major areas of science? The answer is relatively simple: We need to maintain scientific preeminence because it represents a critical national investment that fuels techno-

logical advances that in turn drive the productivity growth that is responsible for our continued economic well-being. The correlation between investment, both public and private, and productivity is striking and well documented. As our national investment in infrastructure, education, and civilian R&D grew in the 1950's and 1960's, so did the country's productivity; as it flagged in the 1980's, so did productivity.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the SSC tell us that we need not maintain our leadership in all areas of science. Some skeptics believe that we should no longer devote our energies toward finding out what the universe is all about and concentrate on less expensive, and supposedly more practical research projects, such as health and advanced technologies.

Is the SSC really a worthy but nonessential project that should be put aside until we can afford to fund such scientific luxuries? Is the research to be done at the SSC tangential and less potentially useful than other scientific pursuits? One thing we do know, is that we cannot predict in advance which areas of science will contribute to important new technologies. For example, basic research in electromagnetism, thought to have no practical benefit at the time, was an essential element in the development of modern communications. And, mathematics, usually considered highly abstract, has made possible powerful computer software to design aircraft and predict storms.

The conviction that nature will prove to be fundamentally simple, if only we can penetrate its outward complexity, is the hallmark of scientific thought. The super collider is the most powerful tool ever designed to pursue that goal. The quest to understand the nature of matter does not lie at the periphery of scientific esoterica; it is right at the center of the scientific mainstream.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the SSC like to emphasize its cost. Some would have us believe that SSC is a large portion of the Nation's R&D budget and that it drains resources from other scientific endeavors, particularly health research. This is simply not true. SSC funding is less than 1 percent of a total Federal R&D budget of \$76 billion. It is dwarfed by the nearly \$10 billion National Institutes of Health budget, and it is only a small portion of the civilian basic research budget of \$13 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be folly to abandon the super collider now. This machine was first proposed in 1982. Research and development has continued for more than a decade, and in 1989 we made a commitment to build this project. Yet, each year we come to the floor and reconsider that decision. Each year we decide whether or not we made the right decision last year. Each year young particle physicists wonder whether they will be able to make a career in this field or whether they will have to abandon it. Each year the 7,000 people now working for the SSC laboratory, on related research at 100 universities, and at industrial enterprises throughout the country wonder whether or not they will have a job next year. Each year potential foreign partners wonder if they can afford to become involved in a project that may never be finished.

This is no way to fund scientific research. We owe it to young scientists who are at-

tempting to make rational career decisions to come to our own decision on the super collider and stick with it. We owe it to the thousands of employees and their families who have made a commitment to design and build this machine to come to a decision and stick with it. And most of all, we owe it to the American taxpayer, who has been willing to fund scientific research generously, even in relatively hard times, not to waste the money that has already been spent to bring this project to completion.

If we do not build the SSC, it will never be built. No other nation, or group of nations, is capable of undertaking this project. The SSC will be the most powerful scientific machine ever built, and it is something only the United States can achieve. We cannot afford to indulge in this type of myopia which would have us concentrate only on short-term goals. We need to make better use of our world leadership in science, not to lose heart and abandon that leadership.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE,  
AND TECHNOLOGY,

June 21, 1993.

CONFIDENTIAL MEMO

To: George E. Brown, Jr., Chairman.

From: Christine Wegman.

Subject: Potential SSC dipole magnet contract cost overrun.

On Tuesday, June 15, officials from General Dynamics (GD) briefed Science Committee staff on the status of the SSC dipole magnet program. GD, the contractor, said that they had identified additional costs necessary to ensure that the magnets meet SSC specifications and American Society of Mechanical Engineers code standards. These new costs had increased GD's Estimated Cost At Completion (EAC), revised semi-annually, and most recently in May 1993. DOE acceptance of the revised EAC could lead to an increase in the contract ceiling, that is, a cost overrun. At the time of the briefing GD was unable to estimate the amount of the possible cost overrun. GD has fired three company vice presidents and two senior managers as a result of this problem. The contract problem has become public because investigators with Mr. Dingell's O&I Subcommittee called GD officials in to question them about a possible overrun.

I next spoke with SSC lab staff members, Ed Siskin, the SSC Project General Manager, and Tom Bush of the magnet lab. They each stated emphatically that no cost overrun has occurred or is anticipated with this contract and that they are questioning the basis of the revised EAC with GD. Siskin noted that in March 1993 he was required by GAO and Energy and Commerce staff to make public the amount of money the lab had reserved internally for this contract. This amount was \$288 million, \$45 million more than the current contract ceiling of \$239 million. On May 19, General Dynamics informed the SSC lab staff that the revised EAC could amount to as much as \$288.5 million, an amount surprisingly close to the now public SSC internally budgeted amount.

Tom Bush, whose staff is questioning the new EAC, item by item, stated that the EAC revision is three or four months late and the SSC lab has had great difficulty with GD staff over its tardiness. He noted that a new general manager at the GD magnet plant in Hammond, LA was brought in at the beginning of this calendar year because of this and other contract problems. Bush stated that GD has "over-specified" the contract, that

is, engineers have been overly conservative in procurement specifications in order to ensure virtually a zero magnet failure risk, going well beyond normal commercial practice. Bush says this is normal at the engineering and procurement level, and that generally management will question cases where the specifications are too conservative, thus too costly. He characterizes the potential cost overrun as a management failure at GD. SSC lab staff are reviewing all procurement and specification decisions with GD engineers and procurement staff. Bush said the process is going well, with both sides working amicably together, and that it should be completed in August. Bush said he is certain that they will come out within \$1 million of the original \$239 million EAC.

The chronology of events is as follows. In March 1993 SSC lab made public to GAO and Energy and Commerce Committee staff the amount of money in the budget for this contract (\$288 million). On May 19 GD staff contacted Tom Bush at the SSC lab, stating they had identified new costs which could increase the contract ceiling to as much as \$288.5 million. On June 7 Energy and Commerce staff contacted the SSC lab and at about the same time requested GD to explain the problem. On June 14 GD met with Energy & Commerce staff. On June 15 GD briefed us.

At this time, GD has made no request for an increase in the contract ceiling and SSC lab has not agreed to any increased procurement costs. My own opinion is that the potential increase in this contract to \$288.5 million is too close to the SSC lab's internal estimate of \$288 million to be a coincidence. It may be that GD top management is attempting to take advantage of the SSC lab's internal budget assumption being made public. The management problems at GD, however, are real and predate SSC's disclosure of their budget assumption. Tom Bush thinks "over-specifying" at this stage in a contract is normal and will usually be weeded out by management. I see no reason to question that opinion at this time. By August we should have a better idea where the contract stands. The timing of GD's public disclosure of the problem was forced by an Energy and Commerce staff inquiry. It is unfortunate and premature that the dispute should be made public just as the appropriation bill goes to the floor; however, at this time there is no cost overrun and there is every reason to believe SSC lab staff is on top of the problem.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this amendment. Contrary to what the proponents description of this as a fiscally responsible vote, it would be fiscally irresponsible for us to walk away from a \$2 billion investment already made by the American taxpayers.

Why? Well, here are a few things to consider before we tell the American public that we are going to throw away \$2 billion of their dollars.

Killing the SSC would result in termination costs in the hundreds of millions of dollars to cover the phaseout of 2,000 employees, canceling contracts, jobs, land recovery and more—hundreds of millions of dollars that would bring no return to taxpayers.

Over 7,000 jobs across the country would be lost along with their contracts. Many of

these jobs are in critical technical and manufacturing areas, helping to provide a conversion from defense spending in many cases.

U.S. industry would lose the opportunity to develop an infrastructure for superconductivity in this country. This is a market that an international conference in Japan estimated will reach \$8 to \$12 billion by the year 2000.

Further, superconductivity will play a major role in our technological competitiveness. Applications for superconductivity include transportation—especially the maglev trains—energy conservation, developing motors and magnetic storage systems. Beyond that, there is the telecommunications industry, where microprocessors and sensors will have a major impact in the global marketplace, and the area of medicine where magnetic resonance imaging, already helping to save lives, will continue to be a growth market.

In terms of electrical power, upon which the Pacific Northwest depends, superconducting magnetic energy storage will one day help our utilities control power fluctuations that now cost business roughly \$12 billion per year in lost productivity time. Magnetic energy storage will help local communities maintain backup energy during peak power use, thus avoiding dangerous blackouts.

Mr. Chairman, every time you turn on your TV, use your PC, or make long-distance calls, you have entered the world of technology made possible by our research into the atom. Already, computer systems are being developed that will process in one second the information contained on 10,000 floppy discs. This technology will soon be available commercially.

And beyond all the business and globally competitive reasons to support the continuing of the superconducting super collider project, there is tremendous impact the SSC is having on education in America today.

Each year, more than 20,000 students and teachers across the Nation participate in SSC education programs designed to improve math and science skills. At this moment, there are more than 120 universities involved in SSC research. Imagine, the most brilliant minds in our Nation, coming together in one place to unlock the mysteries of our world, and share in the wonder of each other's discoveries. They are exploring the frontiers of human knowledge, asking the next question, and searching for answers that will change the world.

In my State, the University of Washington departments of physics, mechanical engineering, and industrial engineering are deeply involved in the design and construction of the two particle detectors at the superconductor lab. Many undergraduates and graduate students are involved in these projects, and are extraordinarily excited to be participating in such a critically important project.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the collider will find what it is being built to find; the particles yet unseen that were abundant during the beginning of the universe. The SSC essentially represents an opportunity to develop a microscope that is 50 times more powerful than anything else we have at present. And that will enable us to discover those particles so we can study the fundamental principles that govern all types of matter



and force. In a nutshell, we will be able to read the book of rules for our universe.

In his testimony before the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Dr. Steven Weinberg, noted physicist from the University of Texas, discussed the breakdown of the standard model theory that has been used to account for all the forces and particles we have been able to study with existing facilities. We know that the standard theory is not final because there are some things it cannot explain. And that tells physicists where to look for clues to a deeper theory.

When the standard theory was used to predict what would happen at energies that are 20 times greater than what we can create today, the theory broke down. It failed, and produced nonsense. In doing this, the standard theory exposed the fact that new energies yet discovered must be in existence. And in order to find them, particle collisions 20 times greater than those we can create at present must take place—and the SSC is designed to do just that. In short, the collider will be able to discover something really new and important.

Now, I am not a scientist, and I am the first to admit that the study of high energy physics has never been a goal in my life. But I do know that we have the capability to create a collider that will find the next building blocks of the universe, encourage research in fundamental science and next level technologies, and keep America where it should be—as the world's leader in fundamental research. Our brightest students and scholars will remain here to study, remain here to apply this new knowledge to better our lives and the lives of others around the world. Ultimately, the economic returns of this investment will be significant. And having already spent billions of their dollars, the U.S. taxpayers deserve no less than that.

Columbus knew and never doubted the world was round. And he had the courage to go defy the naysayers who argued against throwing money at an adventure that was doomed to fail. Did he know exactly what he would discover? Not really, but his calculations showed with mathematical certainty that something was there, that the world was not flat. And as he sailed into the unknown, the question was never whether he would find something. The only question was what extraordinary discovery would be made.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] control 15 minutes of the 30 minutes allotted to this gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, all the debate over the SSC really boils down to one question: Is this project a high enough priority to merit continuing—and escalating—funding as we

struggle to reduce the deficit? The House answered that question with a resounding "no" last year, and events since then should only have strengthened our resolve.

Weighing priorities is a matter of assessing costs and benefits—so let me take each in turn. Costs are easy to talk about: the whole spending history of this project can be summed up with one phrase from a Grateful Dead song: "trouble ahead, trouble behind."

This chart makes the "trouble behind" abundantly clear. The chart displays the ever escalating cost estimates for the collider—estimates that sometimes seem shorter-lived than the protons that will be streaming inside the machine. The current \$11 billion figure is a GAO rough estimate because the administration admits that it won't have its own reliable cost estimate until the fall. So now we're expected to keep shoveling money into this project without even knowing how big a hole in the budget it represents.

The open-ended cost estimate is a sign of trouble ahead—trouble inherent in the proposed stretch out of construction. We're expected to take on faith that the stretch out schedule is realistic. Yet, as this chart shows, the new schedule would require annual appropriations of at least \$1 billion after 1998—just at the point when the administration's own estimates show the deficit creeping back up.

I might also point out that the decision to stretch out the project, is in itself a sign that the SSC isn't considered an immediate priority. That's why SSC supporters argued so vociferously against a stretchout just last year.

But then SSC supporters have had to eat a lot of their own words. They've promised us in the past that the project would be killed if it would cost Federal taxpayers more than \$5 billion, if the total price exceeded \$5.9 billion, if foreign contributions did not cover 20 percent of the costs, if foreign contributions by this year did not equal \$650 million. Now DOE finally admits that foreign contributions are unlikely ever to total more than \$400 million, despite years of begging. We are left with a string of broken promises.

SSC supporters have matched their overblown promises concerning costs with overblown descriptions of the project's benefits. Most recently, they have touted the SSC as a cancer research facility because the project could be—just could be—used for an experimental treatment known as proton beam therapy. But guess what? For the cost of the collider, we could build 500 proton beam facilities. So the collider hardly turns out to be a boon to cancer patients.

Then there's the claim that the SSC will help our economy. But collider research is the most indirect route to developing commercially viable techniques and products. Perhaps that's

why foreign governments have been unwilling to ante up. The collider isn't even a useful way to develop commercially viable superconducting magnets because the machine uses such uniquely expensive technology.

Finally, there is the claim that killing the collider would doom science as we know it. SSC supporters keep invoking Columbus; they make it sound sometimes that a few years without the SSC, and we'll all be believing that the earth is flat.

I suggest you talk to some scientists. Many scientists—including Nobel Prize winners and a past president of the physicists' professional society—fear that it is the SSC itself that is most likely to doom science in this country. While the Federal agencies that train and fund most of the scientists in this country are turning down more than two-thirds of their applications, the SSC—a single project in a single subfield of science—the SSC is eating up \$11 billion.

And to add insult to injury, we now find that some of this \$11 billion is being used for such urgent expenditures as buying and insuring great art works for the walls of SSC managers' offices. What ever happened to C.P. Snow's concerns that art and science had become two unbridgeably separate cultures?

In short, the costs are immediate, real, uncontrolled, and escalating; the benefits are distant, theoretical, and limited. You don't have to be an atomic scientist to figure how that calculation works out. We can't afford the SSC right now. Let us reiterate what this body said last year, and vote to kill it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1550

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], to whom I would like to express appreciation for his hard work on this project.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, welcome to Jurassic Pork. Like the dinosaurs of old, the super collider is lumbering once again across the legislative landscape, searching, foraging, seeking more dollars for its survival.

Proponents paint a picture of the super collider which reminds us of Barney, the dinosaur friend of kids nationwide. Yet the super collider is more like the mighty Tyrannosaurus rex, devouring everything in its path; soaking up billions of dollars and crowding out other important science funding.

The latest estimates show that the super collider will cost upward of \$12 billion to construct and half a billion each year to operate. Cost overruns promise to drive the price even higher.

With our massive Federal deficit still hovering over our economy like pterodactyls, we simply cannot afford this

behemoth of a science experiment. My constituents sent me here to make tough spending decisions. Five years from now we will look back and see the fabled fossil, the super collider, and say we made a good vote in 1993.

Early this month Texas voters voted overwhelmingly to slash Federal spending. Let the cuts begin.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], a member of the committee.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, how can you pretend to be the world's leader without being the world's leader? And this includes science, and this includes the SSC.

Properly managed and properly articulated, this program will be an inspiration to our young people, more of whom will become scientists, mathematicians, and engineers, which we desperately need in our economic struggles in the world.

But I will tell you, there is another reason to vote for this and to continue it, that is both it is exciting and emotional, as far as I am concerned, and that is Stephen Hawking, the British theoretical physicist, who has what may be the best scientific mind in a millenium, trapped in a body wracked by disease, waging a desperate battle to finish his research before he is totally incapacitated.

I am told that the results from experiments in the SSC, with 20 times the energy of the Fermi accelerator, may very well provide just the data he needs to finish his calculations, solving many of the mysteries of the universe, inspiring our young people, and placing our country in the forefront of technology and science.

Please support this program.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the SSC, and in opposition to the reduction in the superconducting super collider.

The benefits of the SSC range from near-term benefits derived from building the high-technology components of the SSC to the long-term benefits forthcoming from basic research and discoveries to be made with the SSC.

In the near term, the SSC is already having an impact on the technological competitiveness of the country. For example, the large-scale use of superconducting magnets at the SSC is greatly strengthening the capabilities of U.S. industries in this field.

In the area of electronics, the detector collaborations are already working with industry to develop specialized integrated circuits to efficiently handle the enormous amount of data expected at the very high event rates of the SSC.

An idea of some of the potential benefits of the SSC can be seen from our past experience with particle accelerators. The brilliant x-

rays used to determine the structure of the AIDS virus came from electron synchrotrons that were first used in high energy physics research. Proton beams that can be targeted to specific areas of the body without damaging surrounding healthy tissue are used for treatment of certain types of cancer and other diseases. Even the television screen and computer monitor are direct descendants of the very first particle accelerator. It does not take a leap of faith to conclude that discoveries with the SSC may produce even more profound changes and adaptations of the world around us in the future, rather it would be extraordinary if it did not.

Of more immediate importance, the SSC is providing high-technology jobs in many areas ranging from underground construction technology to superconducting magnets to high-speed electronics and computing. Presently, approximately 7,000 people are working directly on the SSC, many of them for industrial firms which have in the past been defense oriented. The demands of high-technology projects such as the SSC will play a vital role in the transition to a stronger civilian industrial base in the wake of the end of the cold war.

The SSC also is already having a substantial and growing impact on science education at all levels. Approximately 25,000 students and teachers participated directly in SSC educational activities in fiscal year 1992. In addition, university faculty and students from over 100 university groups across the United States are involved in the SSC scientific program. The SSC has a dramatic appeal that can inspire American youth to pursue careers in science and technology, a highly important contribution to the health of the Nation.

The most profound effects of the SSC on our culture are expected to come from basic research using the facility to probe the heart of matter.

Through Einstein's famous relation  $E=Mc^2$  this concentrated energy can create new massive particles not presently known. Some of these particles will help to explain where mass comes from, why some particles have it and others do not. Other new particles may tell us whether all the forces of nature were once unified by the high energies at the beginning of time.

At present, it is difficult to understand what these SSC discoveries could mean in terms of everyday life. This was also the case when electricity and magnetism were finally understood in the 19th century and when quantum mechanics was discovered in the early part of this century. The discoveries of these great fundamental truths would be amazed by the present-day consequences of their work.

I urge your opposition to reducing the funding of the SSC. The SSC is an important and far-reaching investment in the Nation's future. Our leadership position in the world and our economic competitiveness depend on this kind of investment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the superconducting super collider.

Yesterday I spoke on the important investment we are making by promoting our high-technology research capabilities.

Today I would like to emphasize our need for making responsible choices. As a country we must prioritize what we believe to be important investments for our future. We must live within our means. We must reduce and eliminate the Federal deficit. But at the same time, we must continue to plan and invest in our future. The SSC is exactly that kind of investment.

We do not have to look too far to begin to see some of the real benefits of investing in this new technology: SSC technologies are enhancing a cancer treatment known as photon beam therapy; SSC magnet technology is being explored as a means of providing cheaper, cleaner and more efficient energy for cities; SSC technology is being used to test prototype trains that levitate and travel at speeds up to 300 miles per hour.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Slattery amendment. Invest in our future. Support the superconducting super collider.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the super collider and I urge my fellow Members to vote in favor of its continued funding.

The super collider not only represents the future of our scientific knowledge, it represents the future of our economy by providing high-skilled jobs for our work force.

There are those who point to the super collider as an easy budget-cutting target, but the super collider represented only .6 percent of all Federal research and development dollars in 1992 and continues to be only a small percentage of Federal research funding.

This project means 15,000 jobs all over the country and should not be abandoned due to a temporary downturn in our economy. I ask my fellow Members to imagine where we would be if we had abandoned all of our major scientific ventures in the past because they appeared to be too expensive at the time.

Think for a moment about all that has already been built and imagine it sitting useless, not realizing any of its potential while our understanding of the nature of matter and the origins of our universe stands still. Members, I urge you to vote in favor of this project because it will ensure that we continue to move forward in our scientific endeavors.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Chairman, I come from a technical background and over 20 years in the aerospace community. Let me tell you, we need the SSC. Our future in the trade world is in producing high tech products, and the way you produce high tech products is you do your homework, you do the research, and that is where the products come from.

We cannot compete anymore in many of the basic industries. High tech is our future; research is the way to go.

This is a computer chip. Right now it is today's technology. It is 1 million



bits of storage on this little piece of silicon in the middle. This was produced because 12 years ago we were willing as a nation to fund the synchrotron, which is the predecessor to the SSC.

We are about to announce the next generation of smaller and faster computer chips through x-ray lithography using the synchrotron. Clearly, the SSC is that next generation of device that will allow us to produce those products that we need in America to compete in the world.

Research is the key to our future in the world of products. Please support the SSC. America needs it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I only have 2 minutes, so let me be brief. President Bill Clinton is for the SSC. I will put a letter in the RECORD. Former President George Bush is for the SSC. I will put a letter in the RECORD. Congressman BOB LIVINGSTON is for the SSC. I will put my statement in the RECORD.

But I would like to add that there are a couple of points to which I would like to speak today. There has been much talk about the costs. There has been a statement to the effect that not enough countries are coming through for this project.

We have been trimming this project back since it started. No country in their right mind wants to come up with an upfront expenditure for their costs unless we demonstrate we are serious. And we are certainly not demonstrating we are serious in some of the debate today.

Second, the gentleman from New York says that the project is expected to cost \$11 billion to \$14 billion. I have come to the well earlier today, and pointed out that this floor is littered with ostriches, or people who have their heads in the sand. Now it appears we are littered with red herrings. I am beginning to smell them.

There was an \$8.2 billion cost estimate for the SSC prepared in 1990. It has not changed since it was released.

The cost estimate includes \$850 million for contingencies and \$875 million in contributions from the State of Texas. A recently released GAO report, which includes data examined in August 1992, only looked at a small portion of the conventional construction activities, and yet projected a \$630 million cost overrun in the entire conventional construction project.

They extrapolated from that, just as the gentleman from New York has done. They extrapolated from small figures and made them into big figures. Using the same extrapolation today,

the final construction figures actually would be \$261,000 below the original cost estimates.

Mr. Chairman, for the RECORD I include the letters and statement referred to earlier.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, June 22, 1993.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIVINGSTON: Thank you very much for your letter urging my continued support of the Superconducting Super Collider.

Although these are tough economic times, my Administration supports this project as a part of its broad investment package in science and technology.

I welcome and appreciate your support and urge you to enlist that of your colleagues as well.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

KENNEBUNKPORT, ME, June 18, 1993.

DEAR JOE, I am writing to you about a fight you are properly and effectively waging; namely, the fight to keep the Supercollider moving ahead.

I know that all of you in office are facing tough calls on the budget; but it is my strongly held view that it would be wrong to stop the Supercollider project. It is hard to convince non-scientists of the absolutely fundamental importance of Supercollider; but please keep on trying. Generations of Americans to come will be grateful for your foresight.

I am out of politics, out of the public arena. But, I feel so strongly on this project that I wanted to encourage you and all Republicans to vote to keep the project moving forward.

I read with dismay that some Republicans, who have heretofore been in favor of The Supercollider, were now considering a "no" vote. I hope that is not the case.

I hope things are going well for you, Joe. You are a wonderful Congressman and all of Texas is lucky to have you there fighting for our interests and for what is right.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, others have eloquently outlined the practical uses for the supercollider. Already, more than 1,000 scientists and graduate students of 120 colleges and universities are participating in supercollider research. These scientists are gaining direct access to the forefront of particle physics, which is the core to understanding the origin of matter.

Many of our most important scientific discoveries have come from the work of physicists who have used particle accelerators to research atoms and the particles that make-up atoms. However, existing colliders have reached their limit. There are theories to explain what we don't know about the basic building blocks and forces of nature, but without the SSC, physicists will not be able to prove their theories with experiments and evidence. To turn our back on existing progress of the study of the basic structure of matter and energy would be a monumental mistake.

The famous Stephen Hawking, distinguished professor of mathematics from the University of Cambridge, says:

"Without the SSC, fundamental physics in the United States is likely to stagnate in the

future. This would be a great pity because it has done so much in recent years to move us closer towards the goal of a complete knowledge of the basic laws that govern the universe."

But what would our Founding Fathers say. Men such as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, men to whom the practice of science and the pursuit of knowledge were almost as dear as liberty itself. Scientists themselves, men with extraordinary talents in both science and civics.

Ben Franklin, in his famous experiment, held a kite and key to the sky to probe the electricity of lighting. For the 18th century, it was a bold and breathtaking experiment, a crucial discovery for the progress of mankind.

Today, in the latter part of the 20th century, the supercollider is the equivalent to Ben Franklin's kite and key. In the name of Franklin and in the spirit of a mind which is in a constant quest for knowledge and discovery, I hope we continue funding this project and keep America first.

Nationally, more than 45,000 SSC procurement awards and contracts have been made in 47 States and the District of Columbia. Most of these procurement awards have been made outside of the State of Texas.

In 1993, the SSC laboratory will directly employ over 2,000 people and between 1,200 and 1,400 people in construction jobs. When adding jobs as a result of contract awards across the country, the SSC employs over 7,000 people.

The land acquisition for the SSC is nearing completion and tunneling of the ring is well underway, with 30 miles already under contract to five U.S. firms. Prototype magnets have successfully passed all critical tests and are in production at three U.S. industrial facilities. It would be foolish to waste the tremendous progress that has already been accomplished by cutting the funding for this vital project.

The \$8.2 billion cost estimate for the SSC prepared in 1990 has not changed since it was released. The cost estimate includes \$850 million for contingency and \$875 million in contributions from the State of Texas.

The recently released GAO report, which includes data examined in August of 1992, only looked at a small portion of the conventional construction activities and yet projected a \$630 million cost overrun in the entire conventional construction budget.

Using the same extrapolation today would show that final conventional construction figures could actually be below original estimates.

Instead of being over budget, the construction contract, approximately 14 percent complete, is now \$261,000 under budget. DOE made this information available to GAO and SSC opponents but it was apparently ignored.

The Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1993, said:

Supercollider officials disputed the report's findings. "We are in control of costs," said Ed Siskens, general manager of the SSC Laboratory, which runs the supercollider project. He said the alleged cost overruns were the result of a disagreement between the inspector general's office and the supercollider office concerning the nature of contracts.

According to Mr. Siskens, the supercollider allots less money up front to subcontractors

than their likely costs, fully expecting to make additional reimbursements later as needed. He said that the inspector general recorded all reimbursements beyond the original allotment as cost overruns, even though they weren't necessarily unexpected.

Finally, the argument about neglecting other scientific research and about not funding enough grants at NIH does not hold water.

The annual bill is about to come to the floor to provide NIH in just 1 year—over \$11 billion. We annually fund just NIH \$10 to \$11 billion a year.

Where is the neglect to other science? Give me a break.

We fund over 6,000 new NIH grants a year. National Science Foundation—over \$3 billion coming in next week; National Cancer Institute, \$2 billion; heart/lung and blood, \$1.2 billion; diabetes, \$716 million; neurological disorders, \$630 million; infectious disease, \$1 billion; general medical sciences, \$875 million; dental research, \$169 million; child health, \$555 million; Eye Institute, \$290.2 million; environmental health, \$264.2 million; aging, \$420 million; arthritis, \$223 million; deafness, \$162 million; alcohol, \$185 million; drug abuse, \$425 million; mental health, \$613 million; general research, \$328 million; and all other NIH accounts, \$600 million.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in 1985 when this project was first announced, it was supposed to cost \$4.5 billion. By 1991 it has risen to \$5.9 billion. Only \$4.1 billion of that was supposed to be Federal money. Secretary of Energy Watkins said, "We won't support the SSC if it is a dime over \$5.9 billion. We promise."

In 1992 the official cost rose to \$8.25 billion. The Federal share was supposed to be \$5.65 billion.

Now independent cost estimates tell us this turkey is going to cost us at least \$11 billion, plus at least \$2 billion in stretch-out costs. And at most, according to the administration, only \$400 million in foreign contributions are expected, in comparison to what was supposed to be \$1.7 billion.

I know that the Government has salted SSC contracts around in 47 States, including my own, to try to save this program politically. But, frankly, it is time to say enough. The deficits are too big, other needs are too urgent. The super collider might be nice to have someday, but for now we need to put it on the shelf until we can afford it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise Members that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has 3½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has 13½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has 9 minutes remaining.

□ 1600

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Slattery/Boehlert amendment to terminate funding for the SSC.

This House has heard a great deal of exaggerated rhetoric against this project in recent days. Let's get to the heart of the matter—this is an extremely important scientific project, but is it one we can afford as a Nation? The answer is yes.

Let's look at the facts.

During fiscal year 1992, the SSC accounted for 0.6 percent of the total Federal research and development budget. Let me say that again. The SSC accounted for 0.6 percent less than 1 percent of the money spent by our Government on research and development.

And what do we as a nation get in return for this expenditure?

We get an installment on the most significant scientific research project that will be undertaken by our country in the remainder of the 20th century.

No one can make precise predictions about all the knowledge to be gained from the SSC; however, we do know that already it has led to the production of faster computers, more sophisticated computer chips and cheaper, better superconducting wire.

It has been estimated that 25 percent of our Nation's current GNP is directly attributable to advances in quantum mechanics over the past 100 years. The SSC could well make a similar contribution to the productive capacity of the United States during the remainder of our life time.

President Clinton said it best in a letter to BILL NATCHER last week.

The most important benefits of the increased understanding gained from the SSC may not be known for a generation. We can, however, be certain that important benefits will result simply from making the effort. The SSC project will stimulate technologies in many areas critical to the health of the U.S. economy. \* \* \* Abandoning the SSC at this point would signal that the United States is compromising its position of leadership in basic science—a position unquestioned for generations.

Listen to what Stephen Hawking, the most eminent scientist of our day has to say about the SSC:

The economic success of the U.S. since the last war has in large part been due to its technological lead over the rest of the world. This has been based on its pre-eminence in basic science, particularly physics. \* \* \* Without the SSC, fundamental physics in the U.S. is likely to stagnate in the future. This would be a great pity because it has done so much in recent years to move us closer toward the goal of a complete knowledge of the basic laws that govern the universe.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about the impact of this vote. We are deciding today whether we will go forward as a nation or whether we will settle for being an also ran on the world stage.

We, as a country, have always chosen to go forward—to lead. I do not want to

be part of a generation that loses its nerve, that concedes that America is no longer a great country, that we are incapable of exploring the unknown and finding new solutions for the economic problems that will confront my children.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Slattery-Boehlert amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction. I point out that every ranking member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is in support of this amendment and opposed to SSC funding.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, several years ago, when the House authorized the SSC, there were two parameters put in. One was that the total Federal contribution to the SSC would not exceed \$5 billion, and second, that foreign contributions would be 20 percent of the total cost of the SSC. Those were the parameters upon which the SSC proceeded forward several years ago. And there was an ironclad commitment to proceed along those lines.

The reason I am standing here today is because the SSC and its supporters have met neither of those parameters in the bill that they sponsored when this House originally authorized this plan.

The Federal contribution is much over the \$5 billion if the SSC is to be completed, and the most generous outline of foreign contributions would be \$400 million out of an \$11 billion project.

When we passed the authorization bill, a deal was struck. A deal is a deal. And now, because the supporters of the SSC cannot come through with their part of the bargain, that is, getting the foreigners to contribute 20 percent and holding the Federal taxpayer contribution to no more than \$5 billion, I believe the time has come to pull the pin on the SSC.

They have had their chance. They had the commitment that they wanted. They could not do the job within the parameters that this House overwhelmingly set several years ago. Now is the time to say that the deal is broken and the SSC ought to be defunded.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I noted that a previous speaker remarked that Secretary Watkins had made a promise. Secretary Watkins, of course, was a supporter of the SSC, but he is no longer with us. Secretary Hazel O'Leary is, though, and she also



supports continued funding for the SSC.

I think it is worth noting that both a Republican President and a Democratic President, the current Democratic President, supported continued funding for the superconducting super collider. It certainly is notable that the administrations of George Bush and Bill Clinton, who have studied this matter in detail, in depth, consulted the scientific community, both support this project.

Now, some may disagree about the scientific benefits of the SSC. We have heard testimony or remarks here today that there are scientists who believe that there are more worthy scientific projects. That is true.

There is also a large body of scientists who believe that the SSC is extremely important for our future in this country, and that body of scientists will tell us that this project is providing unique educational opportunities which will help meet this Nation's critical need for more scientists and engineers.

Educators will tell us the same thing. That body of scientists will tell my colleagues that SSC-related research has already yielded a significant improvement in the magnetic resonance imaging technology used widely in medical diagnostics. They will also tell my colleagues that advances in superconductivity from the project will have an important impact on the energy, transportation, and manufacturing fields. And that same body of scientists will tell my colleagues that building the superconducting magnets for the project will help provide U.S. industry with the infrastructure needed to expand and open new commercial markets for superconductivity.

No matter who we believe, which set of scientists we believe, we should know that even counting this project, the United States is still spending less on basic science research as a percentage of GNP than either Germany or Japan.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by Representatives SLATTERY and BOEHLERT to terminate the superconducting super collider [SSC]. This vote is about fiscal integrity, it is about setting spending priorities, it is about judgment. We do not need any more pseudo-historical lectures on vision and Isabel telling Columbus, "We can't afford it this year."

I taught history myself. Historical vision is not what this decision is about. And here I address myself to all of my colleagues who rail against deficit spending and repeat the mantra of no new taxes, ad nauseam, and then will not cut a penny in pork, but will vote to throw senior citizens out of nursing homes.

The time has come to stop wasting taxpayers' money on this enormous pork barrel project. In fact, if the other body and the conference committee had heeded the will of the House, last June, and terminated the SSC, we would have already saved the taxpayers money and we would not be spending time on this debate today.

When the Department of Energy [DOE] first sold the SSC to Congress in 1985, we were told its total cost would not exceed \$4.4 billion. Two years later, Congress was told the cost would not exceed \$5.3 billion. And so the trend has continued. This year, the Department of Energy is telling Congress that the SSC's total construction costs will exceed \$11 billion.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] recently reported considerable cost overruns, contractor abuses, and the absolute failure of DOE to monitor and account for the expenses associated with the SSC. Yet, Congress continues to build an \$11 billion toy for a select number of high-energy physicists.

Now, I might judge the value of this project differently, if I thought that many of these same Members who champion SSC would ever vote to raise the taxes to pay as you go.

Mr. Chairman, how will future generations of Americans view this Congress as they struggle to pay down our Nation's \$4 trillion, and growing, national debt? Terminating the wasteful SSC project is long overdue and we owe it to all American taxpayers present and future. Support the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to kill the SSC.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me say that until I talked to some of the scientists in Texas about this project, I was lukewarm about it. I really did not understand the parameters of what they are doing.

When I saw so many people assembled, so many brilliant scientists assembled, I began to recognize the potential of what we have in this project.

I know we have priorities. For instance, in defense, one of the things that we are keeping as a high priority is research and development, because we know from past experience how many beneficial things have come from the projects that we have funded.

I think this is a perfect example. I could not understand a lot of this technical language that they used in promoting the project, but I understood one thing: When we bring together the former president of the Soviet Academy of Scientists, when we bring together seven Nobel Laureates, when we bring together the best scientists from all over the world, we are going to have some beneficial results in this country

to keep this country in the forefront of the technological advances that we need to compete worldwide.

□ 1610

I rise in strong support. I do not have any jobs in my district. I am willing to raise whatever is needed to pay for this project. I feel very strongly that this House would be making a mistake if we do not defeat this amendment and fund the super collider.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND].

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slattery-Boehlert amendment, in order to eliminate \$8.7 billion in Federal spending for the superconducting super collider, and to send a message to taxpayers that the U.S. Congress is serious about deficit reduction. While the superconducting super collider's potential for helping humankind better understand the basis of matter could eventually help develop new products, there are issues other than the SSC's scientific value that are of equal importance to this country.

The U.S. Congress must begin to decide our Nation's priorities. How can we continue to ask taxpayers for their help when we are investing in costly projects that have limited immediate use, create an extremely limited number of jobs, and have alarmingly high cost overruns?

Millions of Americans need our assistance to receive basic necessities: health care, an education, or a job. Until we reduce our massive Federal deficit, and invest Federal money in products with immediate large-scale uses, we will continue to hurt taxpayers who have already sacrificed so much for this country.

Mr. Chairman, we need to start somewhere in reducing our Nation's expenditures. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this amendment in order to slay an expendable budgetary giant. For those of us who stand in this House and cry out against wasteful Government spending, I say it's time to make our vote consistent with our rhetoric.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and to put our vote where our rhetoric is.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the SSC.

In this time of fiscal austerity, it is obvious that projects such as the SSC should and will be carefully examined and evaluated. It is paramount that the public's funds be wisely and prudently spent.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that I commend the gentlemen from New York and Kansas for their diligent efforts to reduce Fed-

eral spending. I, too, have long supported that endeavor, as a cosponsor of a balanced budget amendment and as a supporter of an expedited rescission process for the President.

In this vein, I feel that we should concentrate on cutting wasteful spending and address the Federal Government's budget process as we set expenditures for next year and formulate an overall long-term economic plan. However, my definition of reducing wasteful Government spending does not include arbitrarily cutting so-called big ticket items such as the SSC. Indeed, such arbitrary cuts defeat the underlying reasoning behind eliminating Government waste. We have only limited Federal resources, and we must allocate these resources to projects and programs which merit our support. I believe that the SSC is an example of such a program.

The funding level the committee has proposed for the SSC represents only 1.7 percent of all Federal civilian research and development and less than 1 percent of total Federal research and development.

The SSC is the most recent component of an ongoing American high energy physics research enterprise which was started over 60 years ago. It represents an investment in our future that will eventually lead to a better understanding of the way the universe works, thereby raising our scientific awareness of the world around us and improving the quality of life. It is for our children's sake, if for nothing else, that we must continue to push the edge of the envelope of human knowledge.

By searching to unlock the mysteries of elementary particle physics, the SSC will not only prove to be of great interest and benefit to scientific efforts to converge on a final theory on the principles of matter, but it also will provide technological breakthroughs and spinoffs that will translate into everyday uses and commercially advantageous applications, thus boosting our economic competitiveness abroad. Technologies such as a superconducting wire, supercomputing, cryogenics, superconducting magnets, and noninvasive medical diagnosis and treatment are just some of the tangible advancements which are direct results of the SSC. And there are surely further advancements to come. Rarely has a significant technological breakthrough that has led to great economic advancements been the designed result of a particular project. Rather, the discoveries and subsequent windfalls have usually come as an unexpected but much welcomed surprise, a product of delving into the unknown with open minds and brave visions. The invention of the transistor was, for example, a product of studies of quantum mechanics in the 1930's. The transistor revolutionized electronics and facilitated the development of television, computers, and telecommunications, yet it was hardly the designed end to these experiments. Surely the SSC provides similar opportunity and potential for scientific innovation. We should not let this opportunity pass by.

The SSC will also provide jobs. The Department of Energy estimates that the SSC supports over 15,000 jobs around the country. Work on the SSC's giant detectors is being performed at over 100 universities around the Nation. Most of the procurement awards have been made outside the State of Texas. Over

45,000 awards and contracts, in excess of \$1 billion to date, have been made in 47 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of jobs is an issue on everyone's mind. The current economic recovery differs from other post-war recoveries in that significant numbers of new jobs are not being created. It is critical that we focus on our Nation's unemployment rate as we craft an economic policy for our Nation's future.

However, the realities of a post-cold-war world are not to be ignored, and we will appropriately reduce our Nation's military spending, which will affect a great number of Americans involved in our defense industry. I know that many colleagues of mine in this body represent constituents who never dreamed that their efforts over the past two decades to make the United States the world's foremost superpower would eventually help lead to the termination of their jobs. This, unfortunately in too many cases, is now a reality.

But, is a pink slip our thanks for the diligent efforts of the tens of thousands who helped the free world withstand the threat of Communist aggression? I think not. And I would assume that all of my colleagues agree with me. That is why we must concentrate on defense conversion as we reduce our defense spending. The superconducting super collider can play a major role in this effort. Already the SSC has contributed over \$500 million to defense conversion, representing nearly 30 percent of all SSC project subcontract dollars. By project completion, this number is expected to rise to over 50 percent. In this time of pervading talk about reinventing government to streamline it and make it more efficient, doesn't it just make plain sense that we continue to support a program which on its own can help to ease the burden of those who would normally be left without a job because of reduced military spending? I think the answer is clear.

Mr. Chairman, as everyone clearly knows, this project is located in Texas and does bring great benefits to Texas. But, let us not forget the contributions that Texas has made to the SSC. My State has pledged to pick up \$1 billion of the total cost of the project and has already provided \$390 million in funding, a major sacrifice. Texas' economy is dependent not only on the defense industry, but also on the energy industry. And we are all well aware of what has happened in that industry over the past decade. The State is just now coming out of the worst recession it has experienced since the Great Depression, and yet, even at the depth of this recession, Texas pledged \$1 billion for the superconducting super collider. Indeed, money from the State often has kept operations on schedule and running smoothly during times of uncertainty due to irregular funding provided by waffling Federal legislators. What kind of message does Congress send to the States if it cancels programs after aggressively pursuing and securing financial support from them? What kind of message does it send to our neighbors abroad? Or to the world's scientific community? Can America's scientific efforts be taken seriously in the future if we cannot make the necessary long-term commitments to them?

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we are clearly in difficult budgetary times, and we can no

longer afford to postpone the day of financial reckoning further into our children's future. Some say that the time has come to turn our backs on projects such as the SSC, that the American age of leadership and exploration is a luxury of the past that we can no longer afford. I could not disagree more. The SSC is a project which represents not our glorious past, but rather our hopeful future. It should be viewed as an investment, a step toward a higher level of understanding about the world and universe in which we live, a catalyst for economic advancement which will strengthen our global competitiveness, and a symbol of our Nation's commitment to maintaining its global lead in the field of high energy physics. I think it would be shortsighted and mistaken to undermine America's technological future by killing this project, and I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the Members that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has 5 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND], one of the most articulate opponents of the SSC.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, we have been working as hard as we can this session to reduce the Federal deficit. I need not remind anybody that we are asking Americans to reduce Medicare, to reduce our defense capability to what we call "fight one, hold one," to raise revenues, on the promise of significant deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, this project is going to cost \$11 billion before it is over. It is going to require \$62.7 million of taxes out of the State of Nebraska to fund. We hear about spinoffs, but if we need a cancer therapy machine, let us invest in a cancer therapy machine, or a super computer, or a magnetic resonance imaging machine. Let us invest directly in those machines. Let us not spend \$11 billion on the hope and the prayer that some of those advances are going to result.

Mr. Chairman, I think this clearly has become the Lawrence Welk home of this session. This is a symbol of our resolve to reduce the deficit. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment offered by my numerous friends who have all spoken, and there are many: The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND], and I should mention the others, because they would want the publicity, but I will not.



Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that SSC may be the most important scientific project of our lifetime, certainly the most important one we will pass judgment on as Members of this Congress.

Frankly, it is even more important for us economically to be exploring the innermost particles of matter than visit the corners of outer space. The history of investments in particle physics shows beyond a doubt that the payoffs from the SSC will be enormous. For example, quantum mechanics and related physics discoveries made earlier in this century are said to be responsible for about 20 to 25 percent of our current gross national product.

The SSC is also making a difference today. The SSC is generating employment for more than 15,000 workers nationwide, many of whom are former defense workers who would otherwise be dislocated and underemployed.

As someone from California, I cannot ignore that factor.

Let us be honest about what we are fighting about here today. We have a bit of a bias that results from the fact that this is a project for Texas in the minds of some. It did not look that parochial when there were 43 different sites around the country in competition for it. There was tremendous support here on the floor. However, as we now find ourselves focused on one project in one part of our country, it certainly has lost a lot of its attraction for some of us.

I think we are now seeing ourselves as victims of a reverse NIMBY syndrome. What we are saying is that we want the benefits of this project but we simply do not want to pay for it, unless of course it is going to be built in our back yard. I think that is not the kind of leadership we need to be showing. It is certainly not the kind of leadership we are seeing in Germany or Japan, where they are not allowing these kinds of parochial judgments to enter into their decisionmaking process.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot about little science versus big science. This big machine does thousands of little science projects by thousands of people from all across the world, particularly from 100 research universities in this country. We do not do big science on big science machines, we let scientists who need time on this machine do little science projects they conceive of at home.

This project is, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has said, is just six-tenths of 1 percent of our national research budget. It ought to be funded. We have heard a great deal about the cost estimate, but if we had not stretched out the cost in the appropriations process, in real dollars, we would be on target with the 1990 funding. In fact, I think there are a number of elements of this project that are under budget. It in some ways is setting an example.

The real cost here, if we fail to support this, is for future generations who will not get the benefits of the kinds of investments made in the past that are creating jobs today. If we talk about cheating future generations by adding to the national debt, I understand the point, but we had better understand that the national penchant to avoid investment is also cheating future generations.

This kind of research investment is not going to get done with a reduction in the capital gains tax, Mr. Chairman. This is not going to get done by the private sector. This is the kind of long-time public research investment that must be done if the private sector in the future is to flourish.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], and in support of the superconducting super collider [SSC].

The SSC may be the most important scientific project of our lifetime.

There is simply no way of knowing, with any precision, the full range of benefits that will accrue to our country as a result of this investment.

We can, however, look at the history of investments in particle physics and know that the payoff will likely be enormous.

When the basic secrets of electricity and magnetism were discovered in the 19th century, the consequences—electric lights, air conditioners, worldwide communication, and computers, just to name a few—were unforeseeable.

The discovery of quantum mechanics in the early part of this century provided the basis for lasers and solid state electronics. Quantum mechanics and related physics discoveries alone are said to be responsible for 20 to 25 percent of the current U.S. gross national product.

And, the SSC is already making a difference. The SSC is generating employment for more than 15,000 workers nationwide, many of them former defense workers who would otherwise be dislocated.

General Dynamics, for example, is converting its Connecticut submarine facility to construct the SSC's detectors.

At the SSC facilities, IBM is currently developing a computer system that will process the information from 10,000 floppy disks or 3.7 million pages of information in a single second. This cooperative effort is expected to accelerate the entry of high performance, ultra-fast U.S. electronics into the commercial marketplace.

The SSC is also creating the infrastructure needed to provide the United States with the tools to compete in the emerging superconductivity market. An international symposium held last month in Japan estimated that the market for superconductivity will rise from \$1.5 billion currently to \$8 to \$12 billion by the turn of the century.

The SSC will also continue to contribute to the development of new cancer treatments, like proton beam therapy, and enhance other health technologies like magnetic resonance imaging or MRI.

The SSC is also driving other superconducting magnet uses in the energy and transpor-

tation fields, including the development of commercially viable magnetically levitated trains.

Even though the SSC is not yet operational, it is already moving these advanced technologies forward and building a solid foundation for strong, economic growth in the future.

In spite of these many benefits, recent attention has focused on alleged cost overruns and management problems.

But what are the facts?

Wipe away all of the half truths and misleading statements, and it becomes clear that the SSC is both under budget and on schedule.

For example, the most recent data from the Department of Energy shows the construction contract, which is approximately 14 percent complete, is now under budget.

Tunneling costs are coming in under budget while also setting world records for tunneling efficiency.

With 17 percent of the project completed, the SSC has had to tap only 3.5 percent of its contingency funds.

This is a great testament to the Department of Energy and the SSC management, and it is the kind of record that is the envy of projects one-hundredth its size.

The SSC has enormous benefits, both near- and long-term. It is under budget. It is on schedule.

But it remains a substantial investment that requires a certain leap of faith to support—a leap not unlike those that our predecessors had to make for our benefit.

Mr. Chairman, in 1831, following a demonstration of the new miracle of electricity, Dr. Michael Faraday was asked of electricity "What use is it?" He is said to have responded, "Sir, of what use is a newborn babe?"

Like a newborn, the full range of contributions that could emerge from the SSC include those we cannot even fathom. We cannot fathom where the SSC will lead us and what benefits it will yield anymore than a new parent can fathom the unequalled joy and love a child can bring.

We are crossing a threshold into the unknown. We are constructing a world-class scientific instrument that will help build a better future for our children and our children's children.

It is an investment we must make. It is a challenge we must meet. And, its reward will be a more competitive America in the future.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. I urge a vote for the SSC and a brighter future.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in strong support of the SSC and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

The SSC is the most expensive research machine and program this Na-

tion has ever undertaken. Everyday, we use equipment and technology that someone before us had had the courage to explore and try. We take new metals, plastic, and many other materials for granted.

Scientists tell us the exploration the SSC will be capable of will help us to keep competitive with the world. We owe it to future generations to do this now. Better medical diagnosis will be possible. Treatment of cancer tumors found deep in the body can be treated at the site. The proton beam generated by the SSC's linear accelerator will be used without interrupting physics research. This type of treatment is now successfully being used at both Harvard and Loma Linda University Research Center in California. Because of the SSC's more powerful beam, the most inaccessible areas of the human body will be treated which cannot be treated today with the less powerful beams available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has 4½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in support of the Slattery-Boehlert amendment. I am working for its passage. I believe passionately in what they are trying to achieve. We have a \$4 trillion national debt, and it will increase to \$6 trillion in the next 4 years; a budget deficit this year of about \$390 billion; interest on the national debt this year of over \$300 billion; and this \$11 billion public works project.

□ 1620

The United States of America is a science-creating machine without parallel, and the Japanese and the Asian Rim nations are science-consuming machines without parallel.

What we really have is a public works project. The superconducting super collider is basic research. We cannot own it. We will do the work. We will spend the money. But the whole world will learn from this project what we learn.

They are going to spend their money and put it to practical consumer use.

I urge my colleagues to cut this project out now. It is going to go sometime. If it is not this year, it is going to be next year. We simply do not have the money.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before I get into the substance of my comments, let me

make a few statements as regards some of the comments that opponents of the SSC have made. One gentleman said that there was an ironclad commitment made the first time we passed an authorization bill on the SSC on the House floor. We did pass that bill, in the House, but it did not go anywhere in the Senate. That bill said that we would build the SSC by 1996, not by 1999 or the year 2003.

It also set goals, not caps, but goals in terms of foreign participation. That is not quite the ironclad commitment that one of my colleagues talked of.

The super collider project is a project that has been under consideration since 1982. The National Science Foundation, and the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel to the Secretary of Energy issued a report in 1983 or 1984 that said that the project should be a national priority, and that the project was technically feasible. The Congress held oversight hearings in 1985 and voted in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to begin researching the project. In 1986 President Ronald Reagan said that it should be a national priority. In 1987 the Department of Energy began a site selection competition to determine where the project should be located. Over 40 States participated in the site selection process. In 1988 the Department of Energy chose Texas as the site where it would be built.

In 1989 President Bush said that it should be a national priority. Our current President, Mr. Clinton, has also committed to it and said that it should be a national priority.

We spend \$76 billion on basic research for the Federal Government. The super collider is six tenths of 1 percent of the basic research budget, six tenths of 1 percent. The SSC is now 17 percent complete, and we will have spent almost \$2 billion on the project by the end of this fiscal year.

As we speak, there are four tunnel-boring machines in operation. They have already bored over 9 miles of tunnel. They are boring approximately 1 mile a week, and are setting world records in the process.

Of the contingency fund of \$860 million, only 3 percent has been used.

The research conducted by the SSC is something that people cannot do for themselves. If we do not invest in this basic research project at the Federal level, it simply will not be done.

The SSC is our future. We have over 2,000 of the very best minds in the world today working on the super collider, and these minds are not just in Texas, they are at over 100 research universities in this country, and research centers around the world. Many of them have moved to Texas, over 1,600. They have risked their future, and committed their lives to this project. We cannot turn our backs on them. I do not want to be the one to go

to the laboratory in Waxahachie, TX, and say I am sorry that you believed us last year, and the year before, and the year before, and that you have moved your family and committed your future, and that you want to be a part of something that will make the world a better place in the 21st century, but the U.S. Congress does not have the guts to fund it.

The SSC is something we know will work. The magnets have been proven to work. The scientists guarantee that in the energy range that the super collider is going to operate at they will discover something. And if past history is any guide, what they will discover will be commercialized, and will make our world a better place in the 21st century.

Please do not vote to kill this project. Let us keep hope alive.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I come before the Congress to say do not turn your back on something that works, do not turn your back on research and development which is going to cause us to keep our place in American society and in world society.

Some have talked about a lot of short-term gains. They look very apparent at this time that they are going to be good. But they are not. Think of the long-term disaster that we are going to face if we do not support the super collider.

I stand in support of the super collider, and if you are wondering why, let me tell you. I am in support of the super collider because it is the only hope for the future for the people I represent. It gives us a chance, the minorities in this country who helped to build this country, a chance to get into jobs that are developed by technology and science, learning how to create new jobs, learning how to go up to the technological barriers that have been there before.

So the excellence in science and in technology has enabled us in America to come to the high standard of living where we are today. Support minority business and support our going further in science and technology.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, every Member of this institution has developed their own concern about how we do the Nation's business. I would like to share with you mine. Is there not a time when any debate in this institution on any issue ever comes to a closure? I came to this institution hearing about the superconducting super collider. It was an interesting discussion. Through the years I witnessed the debate and cast a vote thinking the judgment had been made.

Then we made it again. And then we made it again. And then we made it



again, and \$2 billion later I find myself in the well making the same speech about the same judgment.

At some point in every institution you make a final decision. This one was made by Ronald Reagan. This judgment was made and 9,000 people went to work, and a thousand scientists started their work, and \$2 billion was spent, and international commitments were made.

The judgment that was made over these 10 years was made for sound reasons, not because we do not understand our economic problems or debts, but because we do. Our economic problems will be solved by growth and by science.

Stay with this judgment. I know it is hard. But the only way out of our economic problems is to grow out of them. Those thousands of scientists, those 9,000 workers, that \$2 billion investment are the answer.

Defeat the amendment. Support the super collider. It is the answer.

□ 1630

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], who is on the subcommittee and who next week will conduct oversight hearings on the mismanagement of this project.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I might remind the gentleman from New Jersey that it was only last year that this House, in fact, voted to kill the super collider. It was a decision that we all made here, and we hope this year that decision will stick when it gets to the other body.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to end business as usual. That has to end.

Folks, we have a \$300 billion deficit. The country coast to coast is demanding that we begin to cut spending.

How many letters does it take to get that message through here? For all of you who demand that we do not raise taxes, I hope that you will be with us as we try to cut spending, because a decision to go ahead with construction of the SSC would be a decision to send good money after bad.

Federal spending continues to run amuck. We are slipping into debt at the rate of \$1 billion a day. We cannot afford the things we need let alone the things that we merely want.

The super collider is a want, not a need, and I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a decision to go ahead with construction of the SSC would be a decision to send good money after bad.

Federal spending continues to run amuck. We are slipping into debt at the rate of a billion dollars per day. We can no longer afford the things that we need, let alone those we merely want.

The super collider is a want, not a need. It would be nice to have. I don't doubt that there would be some scientific benefit to having it, but we cannot afford it. It's as simple as that.

The greatest challenge facing this government and this body is to restore America's fiscal health. We can't do this by taxing more or by running the printing presses down at the Treasury Department faster. We can only do it by controlling spending.

Next week, the Committee on Energy and Commerce will hold hearings on the Department of Energy's management of SSC construction. This follows release of a GAO finding that the project is over budget, behind schedule and likely to cost far more than original estimates.

It also follows the unauthorized leak of the DOE inspector general's draft report on sloppy management and inappropriate expenditures related to the SSC. If the IG's findings are accurate, the project has been a daisy chain of questionable expenditures—including plants, Christmas parties, and employee morale. These are serious charges and those of us on the committee will investigate them fully.

If the charges are true, they will further undermine the case for going ahead with the project. Nonetheless, funding the SSC is still an unwise investment. It's meager economic benefits accrue only to the tiny group of people directly involved in its construction and operation.

Mr. Chairman, we're going to get nowhere on controlling Federal spending until we have the guts to cut this kind of spending.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I support the SSC.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of continued funding for the superconducting super collider. The super collider is important for many reasons and makes contributions to many sectors of society.

Not only will the SSC provide for significant advancements in high-energy physics, manufacturing technology, and education in general, it will provide thousands of jobs and hone the skills of thousands who have lost their jobs due to the defense drawdown. The SSC is creating job opportunities for engineers, scientists, and technicians who have lost jobs because of cutbacks in the defense industry. For instance an engineer who lost a job when General Dynamics cut back because of the defense drawdown could easily transfer that talent to the super collider. I honestly believe that the technologies and industries that will be created from the SSC will expand our economic base and provide thousands of jobs.

This project will provide a basis for students' interest in engineering and the sciences. In order to maintain our economic competitiveness in the world, we must continue to be technologically adept. Technological inventiveness requires a steady supply of bright new

minds entering the field. Unfortunately, we have seen a drop in the number of students enrolling in science and engineering programs in our universities. We must encourage the youth of our Nation to enter these disciplines to guarantee a foundation for the future.

The superconducting super collider is a project that will stimulate enrollment in these important areas. It will improve higher education both regionally and nationally. This project has recruited top-notch scientists to colleges and universities all over the United States that have taken an active role in this project. Visiting researchers from around the globe will use and improve this facility, rather than our scientists going to other nations. The SSC will have a dramatic appeal to inspire young people to pursue careers in science and engineering. The technology required to build and operate such a project will stimulate high-technology industry, causing a greater need for these students.

If we are to keep pace in today's high-technology world economy, projects such as the super collider are a necessity. It is with a sense of urgency that I call upon my fellow Members to support super collider funding this year, before we lose our competitive advantage.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment to kill the super conducting super collider.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has always led the world in scientific research and technological achievement. The SSC will help physicists discover the fundamental nature of matter and energy, which will lead to major advancements in almost every field of technology. Some of the future applications of technology include: High-speed magnetic levitation trains; magnetic energy storage systems for fuel conservation; magnetically propelled ships; and low-loss electric power transmission systems.

Without the SSC, U.S. industry would lose the opportunity to develop an infrastructure for superconductivity in this country, which represents a market estimated to reach \$8 to \$12 billion by the turn of the century.

Furthermore, a failure to follow through with the SSC will profoundly disturb the credibility of the DOE and the U.S. Government to both the world at large and to our own science community. A failure to build the SSC will disrupt the Nation's current high-energy physics program. This is a balanced program and the SSC is an integral part of its focus.

Mr. Chairman, we need to cut the deficit. But we also need to secure our economic future. The investment in the superconducting super collider represents less than 1 percent of our total Federal research and development budget, yet it is an investment in an area of science that has a proven record of economic return.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], a member of the committee.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slattery amendment.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge that we eliminate funding for the superconducting super collider. This multibillion-dollar science project is the kind of runaway spending my constituents want to stop.

As a new Member, I approached this project with an open mind. However, I have come to believe that the SSC is simply too expensive and the benefits are too uncertain to justify spending almost \$12 billion in this time of tight budgets. Let me address one argument in particular that the supporters of this project have made.

Some have argued that cutting the SSC will not result in true deficit reduction, because the money would simply be reallocated by the Appropriations Committee. In fact, my colleague from Arkansas, Mr. DICKEY, and I wanted to offer an amendment to ensure that these funds would be used for deficit reduction only, but, were unable to do so due to rules of the House which prohibit legislation on an appropriations bill.

However, even without our amendment, I want my colleagues to be assured that a vote for the Slattery/Boehlert amendment is a vote for short- and long-term deficit reduction. It will save taxpayers almost \$12 billion over the next several years.

It is my hope that should this amendment pass, the Congress will be able to engage in a little self-discipline and ensure that this money goes toward deficit reduction, nor further spending.

I urge Members of this body to support the Slattery/Boehlert amendment to cut the SSC. We simply cannot afford it.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes, the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, compliment the proponents of the SSC. They have very cleverly limited the debate for a very obvious reason. The weight of the evidence is in support of the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to kill this project.

Let me sum up: This is a project that started out in 1985 with a projected cost of \$4.4 billion. Here we are in 1993, less than 20 percent completed, and the projected cost now exceeds \$11 billion.

The General Accounting Office in a report issued in February of this year said the project is behind schedule and over budget.

The House in 1990 overwhelmingly, by a bipartisan vote, approved a floor

of 20 percent foreign contribution. Now, if you are talking about an \$11 billion project, that 20-percent foreign contribution should exceed \$2 billion, and Japan is supposed to be the biggest contributor. Guess what, we have not seen the first yen yet from the Japanese. As a matter of fact, of the more than \$2 billion projected for foreign contributions, we only have \$65 million in hand.

This is good science. I will not quarrel with that. It is not priority science, and the message from the American people is absolutely clear: They want this Congress to stick to priorities. They want us to reduce unnecessary spending.

The biggest argument comes from the scientific community itself: Nobel laureates opposed to this project. Why? Because it is crowding out other important areas of science. The National Science Foundation is not able to fund all the worthy applications it receives, neither is the National Cancer Institute.

Put this project to rest. Keep faith with the American people.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there used to be an old Texas politician named Pappy Daniels. Pappy was later elected Governor and served in Texas.

He used to go around Texas with a little band. He would shake hands with every constituent he could find, and the band would play, and then he would give a speech, and he would promise everybody everything.

Occasionally somebody would say to him, "Pappy, how are we going to pay for all of this?" And he would turn to the band and say, "Fellas, play another tune."

Well, there are people in this country, particularly in certain States, that want the spending but they are absolutely against paying the taxes. So those that do not want to pay the fiddler should have the music stop. If you do not want to pay the piper, enjoy the sounds of silence.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, if the will of the House had prevailed last year, we would not need to be here debating this same issue this year. While we debate, to no one's surprise, the big ditch in Texas has gotten deeper and our Nation is deeper in debt.

GAO reports:

"Management problems continue to hinder \* \* \* construction \* \* \*" of the SSC.

"As of August 1992 \* \* \* the SSC project was over budget and behind schedule."

"Because of these management problems, affordability issues have arisen \* \* \*"

Just this week a preliminary DOE inspector general's report was released which only served to demonstrate why SSC is and continues to be a budget buster. Some of the bills submitted by the main contractor to DOE included: \$18,403 for coffee, \$21,369 for green plants for offices, \$1,626,605 for relocation costs over 15-months, which is equivalent to \$10,844 per person, and \$293,668 for car rental and leasing.

This report points out that 40 percent, or \$216 million, of the spending represented unnecessary or excessive costs.

Regardless of the scientific merit of this project, the management issues are a matter of grave concern.

The total estimated cost is not yet known, but the project's total cost will exceed \$11 billion—more than double the original estimate.

And the foreign contributions that have repeatedly been promised are still mostly illusory. Although the Department of Energy set a goal of \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions to the SSC, it is confident of obtaining only about \$400 million.

Little of this information is really news—only the numbers have changed. And, the spending continues.

In our family budgets, we know that our wants always exceed our needs. It is the same with the Federal budget. In the case of the SSC, it is not protons that are colliding—it is our Nation's needs and wants.

Let us say "No" to SSC and say it now.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In summary, my friends, let us look at the basic irrefutable facts again. Fact No. 1, this project was projected to cost \$4.4 billion. It is now going to cost at least \$11 billion.

The General Accounting Office says this project is over budget and behind schedule.

□ 1640

The inspector general of the Department of Energy says this has been ill-managed at best in the last few years.

In addition to that, last year, and in previous years, we were told there would be \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions. We do not have that money, my friends. Last year, this body voted 232 to 181 to kill the super collider. Last year, we also passed the Walker-Brown amendment. It said if we did not have \$650 million in the bank by April 1 from foreign countries, we would unplug the super collider. Let us keep our word, this body's word, with the American people and unplug the super collider like we said we would.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding the debate time has expired for the other side.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].



Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the superconducting super collider and in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I urge you to vote against this amendment and for the continuation of this project. I first want to argue that this should not necessarily be a debate about the budget. I understand my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] and others who would argue that if the money can be cut out, we can cut the deficit by that much this year and in the years ahead. I understand that.

I think the likelihood is that the money would not go toward the deficit. This budget is under its cap. In fact, it is \$64 million under its cap. The likelihood is that if the money is knocked out for this project, knowing the feelings of some in the other body, it would be likely that at the end of the day the money would be spent on water projects.

Now, some may argue that water projects are better than this project, but I would urge you to understand that this is probably not a debate about the budget or the budget deficit; it is a debate about whether or not this is a good project.

That is what the debate is about. And I want to urge Members to understand, or at least to consider, that this is a good project that is vital to the economic future of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I was at the graduation ceremony at Northwestern University a year ago; I was honored with an honorary degree. One of the other people being honored there was Bob Galvin, chairman of the board at Motorola.

During the graduation exercise, he turned to me and said, "I certainly hope," and this is a year ago, "that the Congress will vote for the collider project." I said, "Bob, why do you even care about it? You are in the cellular phone business and the pager business." He said, "What you need to understand is that the success of my company," which has doubled and tripled and quadrupled in sales over 20 years, "is directly related to the basic research that has gone on at the Fermilab and the collider that is in Illinois." He said, "When you were a young man in chemical class in high school, there were probably 90 elements that were on the chart of physical elements. Today, there are many more than that because of the basic research in physics that has been done with these collider projects."

He said, "The whole development of newer products and new technology comes from our ability to break down atomic particles, to have more infor-

mation about the subatomic particles." He said, "The problem with it is a 20-, 30-year lead time. If you will give our scientists the basic research information, which we can never afford to produce, they will find the new products."

He said, "I can't guarantee it to you, I can't show it to you in black and white, but I know it to be true." And then he said this, "America has always been the leader and, therefore, had a high standard of living because we have always had the leadership, courage to spend the money to make the investments in basic research projects like this one."

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a vote about our future. I am deeply worried about the standard of living in this country, where it is going, where it is, and will be 20 years from now.

We face the toughest competition we have ever faced. Japan and Germany and others on one side, Thailand, China, Mexico, and others on the other side. A lower standard of living in one case, a higher standard of living in the other. But I know one thing, if we are to compete and we are to have a higher standard of living, we have got to make these long-term investments in the basic scientific knowledge that lies at the heart, at the heart of our economic ability, and our ability to have a high standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to reject the idea that somehow we are going to save a lot of money and stand for voting this project, for our children and our grandchildren and their jobs and their standard of living. That is what is at stake.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Kansas and New York, which would reduce the energy and water development appropriations bill by \$400 million by terminating the superconducting super collider project.

I do not call for this project's termination because I believe that it is in any way unimportant. It is clearly important and the research generated by it may provide many beneficial byproducts at some point in the future. My problem with the superconducting super collider is that at this time we simply cannot afford it.

Over the past few weeks, the Members of this House and the Members of the other body have been going through a wrenching debate on our national priorities. A discussion about many of the programs that the most vulnerable of my Chicago district constituents count on for help, have been proposed for dramatic retrenchment. Programs like Medicare and Medicaid, which allow us to provide minimal health care to some of our poor and elderly, and empowerment zones which stimulate job growth where it is needed most in our center cities, suburban and rural communities have all been on the chopping block. I cannot support this project and at the same time watch as some in Congress dismantle the programs

that would help the poor residents in my district on the west side of Chicago redevelop their neighborhoods. I cannot support this project as we dramatically decrease the disproportionate share payments to hospitals which provide the most basic health care services for many residents in my community like Cook County General Hospital.

Our job as Members of Congress is to rank the priorities of our Nation. That process by its nature causes us to make very difficult trade-off decisions. When we stack up all of the instances that we are being forced to cut back and all of the needs that are slated to go unfulfilled, I do not believe that the super collider, in spite of its benefits, can take precedence over our many immediate problems.

Mr. Chairman, after I listen to all of the claims about this project's benefits and possible future usefulness I am left unmoved. Not because I do not believe it is useful because I am sure it has usefulness. I am unmoved because I am not convinced that a superconducting super collider is one of our most important priorities. I urge the Members of this House to think carefully about all of our real needs when they cast their vote. If they do, I believe they will come to the same conclusion that I have. Cut the collider.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the super collider is a super mess and a recent Government audit confirms it.

The inspector general of the Energy Department has found that over \$216 million—over 40 percent—of super collider contracts were either overpriced or unnecessary.

In fact, the only collision to date has been between the original budget estimates and fiscal realities.

Yesterday, we debated ending the biggest pork barrel ever shot into space; today we're debating an end to the biggest pork barrel ever dug underground.

The super collider will cost over \$11 billion; that is more than \$7 billion over the original estimated cost of \$4.4 billion.

That cost overrun has included: \$54,000 for tropical plants; \$35,000 for a staff Christmas party; and, \$122,000 for unspecified staff moral support.

I'm opposed.

I urge my colleagues to support the Slattery-Boehlert amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment and to reaffirm my opposition to continued funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC].

During the last 2 days the talk on this floor has centered on what is best for the country, on what is best for Americans. Supporters of the SSC, like the supporters of the space station *Freedom*, want us to believe that these projects hold the very key to our continued prosperity; without them we will have no future because our children will lose faith in our Nation's commitment to greatness. This is erroneous; such symbolism is no substitute for commonsense programs that deal with the needs of future generations.

Mr. Chairman, the children of America do not fall asleep at night dreaming of being the next Issac Newton, Albert Einstein, or Stephan Hawking. No doubt this is our failure. We need

inspired, visionary men and women to lead us in all our endeavors, especially the sciences. But the super conductor is simply the wrong star to which to attach our dreams. While the idea of living in space and traveling among the heavens in a space station may capture a child's imagination, I doubt very much that the thought of particle science spinning out of Waxahachie, TX, will ever prove as captivating.

On the other hand, if the real goal is to excite children to learn math and science again, we should then seriously address the problems and hurdles that distract us from achieving such goals. For instance, we have all heard by now about the systemic barriers that exist and prevent our young women from reaching their full potential in math and science. Perhaps we can agree today to support and fund the Gender Equity in Education Act and enfranchise the 50 percent of the population that is discouraged. Another important early intervention action could come through Head Start pre-school programs. Despite its proven effectiveness and authorization for full funding of this program, we are barely halfway in meeting the needs of Head Start. The same can be said for the insufficient funding of the Pell grant program. There is no better way to ensure our Nation a continuous supply of bright, innovative new scientists than to ensure that everyone with the potential and desire to be scientists has access to the necessary education. Why don't we agree to better fund these vital programs today rather than continuing to support the super collider? Our current policy path of funding the elite science projects based on political horsepower, while increasing numbers of kids, one in four who live below the poverty level, can't get an education is morally wrong and personifies our fiscal and human deficits with all their inequities.

Mr. Chairman, it is not that I am opposed to funding for the SSC because it lacks scientific merit. I think most Members here would agree that, from a strictly scientific standpoint, the super collider is a worthwhile endeavor. And under different circumstances I have no doubt that there would be very little opposition to this project. In fact, as a science educator, my inclination is to provide strong support for most research. But before funding grandiose projects designed to answer the most basic question "What are the constituent parts of matter?" we must do more to address the basic needs that keep our public constituency intact. Mr. Chairman, that is where our priority should be focused. We cannot just wish for a brighter future, we must act to shape our future.

If the physics behind the SSC is good, the management has, unfortunately, fallen far short. The hoped-for commitments from other nations have not materialized and, of course, the marketplace can't or won't fund the SSC program. Rather, the great entrepreneurs who like only the profits and not the risk part of the free market look to the U.S. taxpayer yet once again. It disturbs me that so many Members continue to decry "government waste," yet when a blatant example of real waste is staring them in the face they refuse to recognize it. The Department of Energy inspector general's report has not been officially released, but the facts in the report are clear and should

not be disregarded by this House. The report says in all "forty percent of the expenditures on the SSC so far have been unnecessary, excessive, or represent[s] uncontrolled costs." How does that jive with the constant and renewed promises of low-cost and efficiency by the advocates of the SSC project? If we ignore this report and vote today to continue funding for the super conductor, well then, we really will be sending our children an unfortunate message: Thanks for the party. Please clean up and pay the bill on your way out.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Slattery-Boehlert amendment and vote to kill the superconducting super collider. The taxpayer price is simply too high.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to cut funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC].

The SSC project was originally expected to cost \$4 billion and the taxpayers have already spent \$1.6 billion. Now we are told that the program will cost more than \$11 billion in construction and operating costs could be as much as \$1 billion per year.

This program is extremely expensive, and the cost estimates keep rising. If the Congress is going to continue to pour billions of tax dollars into it, we had better be sure this is a program which will have some clear benefit to the taxpayers. The SSC does not pass this test. In fact, the Department of Energy ranked the SSC 10th in its list of priority programs. This is hardly a vote of confidence in the merits of the program.

Reports on the SSC conducted by the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have raised questions about the program such as schedule performance and cost monitoring. If we are going to spend the taxpayers' money on this program we had better be sure the money is being spent wisely. Once again, the SSC fails the test.

When the SSC project was begun it was expected that a large part of the funding would come from foreign contributions. However, foreign cash contributions so far have been less than 1 percent. If our foreign partners do not find the program worthy of their financial support, why should the United States?

This program continues to consume more and more of the Federal dollars available for scientific research, taking away resources which would otherwise be available for programs with clear merit and clear benefit.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are demanding that Congress and the President cut spending and balance the budget and make the tough choices necessary to get our fiscal house in order. Almost every day I hear my colleagues on both sides of the aisle come to the floor to talk about cutting spending. Now is the time to make good on those promises to make tough choices.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to put an end to the SSC. Let's cut our losses and do the taxpayers a favor.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in strong support of the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. It would be acceptable to fund this massive project if we had the resources, and if it didn't delay or pre-

vent other valuable research and development projects; however, despite any assurances to the contrary, that obviously is not the case.

Last year, this Member and others voted in a bipartisan effort to eliminate funding for the superconducting super collider. However, Senate and House conferees ignored this important House mandate and restored funding for the project in the House-Senate compromise legislation.

This Member has consistently opposed funding for the SSC because it is a project we simply cannot afford. The massive amount of funds the SSC project requires—undoubtedly underestimated like all huge, boondoggle public works and science projects—will drain funds from other worthy science and research and development programs.

In their report entitled, "SSC is Over Budget and Behind Schedule," the GAO notes that in 6 years the Department of Energy [DOE] has increased its estimated cost of the SSC project from \$5.3 to \$8.25 billion. Now, GAO reports that cost estimates for the SSC will exceed \$11 billion.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that these cost estimate increases will not be covered by foreign contributions for the SSC project. The DOE admits there is likely to be a shortfall of \$1.3 billion in these contributions. In February of this year, Taiwan—a significant contributor—wisely withdrew its support for the project.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons and more, this Member remains opposed to funding the superconducting super collider project. It is a giant gopherhole we cannot afford at a time when we have huge deficits and many more important priorities. Furthermore, we will forgo many other valuable scientific research and development projects and programs America desperately needs to maintain its technological competitiveness. Therefore, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlemen from New York and Kansas.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slattery amendment to end funding for the superconducting super collider.

It's bad enough that this \$11 billion physics experiment drains millions of taxpayer dollars each year, but now I am hearing some very disturbing reports about this project.

According to the Los Angeles Times and Wall Street Journal, our constituents' tax dollars being poured into this project have been wasted on Christmas parties, catered lunches, and office plants.

Additionally, a draft audit of the super collider by the inspector general of the Energy Department questions as much as 40 percent of the funds paid to subcontractors for this project. According to this audit, \$216 million in expenditures examined by the inspector general were excessive or unnecessary, or represented uncontrolled growth of cost. For example, taxpayers bought four \$725 lounge chairs for this project. I can't, in good conscience, support a project which has engaged in such waste.

If this mismanagement is typical of how the super collider is being constructed then there is no wonder that the project is behind schedule and over budget.

Our Nation has some tough choices to make. It's time that we realize that we have to



cut wasteful projects that don't deliver. Yesterday, 112 Members from the other side of the aisle—Members who voted against budget reconciliation claiming that there were not enough spending cuts—voted for wasteful spending. Well you can't have it both ways. If you claim to be against wasteful spending then you must vote for the Slattery amendment. I hope those 112 Members don't make the same mistake today.

The time has come for every person in this House to realize that when the people of America demand cut spending, they are talking about programs like the space station and the super collider. I urge all Members who oppose wasteful spending to join me in voting for passage of the Slattery amendment and putting some of this wasteful spending to an end.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I supported the Republican budget alternative plan earlier this year that would reduce the deficit by \$430 billion over the next 5 years.

It was very difficult in formulating this budget to decide which programs to keep and which to cut. Yet the Republican budget alternative retained funding for the superconducting super collider.

Funding was maintained because the SSC represents an investment in the technological future of the Nation.

The wealth of nations rests upon their abilities to harness new technologies. And building and operating the SSC will push American superconducting technology to the cutting edge. It will open new frontiers of science. And it will answer questions regarding the fundamental nature of the universe.

The SSC represents only six-tenths of 1 percent of the entire basic research budget of the United States. But it will become the world's focus for high-energy physics research.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Slattery amendment and support America's future competitiveness—support the SSC.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Representatives SLATTERY and BOEHLERT to eliminate funding for the superconducting super collider project for many of the same reasons I supported Representatives ROEMER, ZIMMER, SHAYS, and other, yesterday in their efforts to eliminate funding for the space station. I believe that we as a nation cannot afford to fund either the space station or the SSC at this time.

As a strong supporter of scientific progress, I am fascinated by the technology behind both the SSC and the space station. I share the enthusiasm of the researchers working on these projects, which may ultimately lead to tremendous scientific advances which will improve the quality of all of our lives.

However, those advances are still highly speculative and come at an extraordinarily high price. I have heard supporters of these two programs argue that spinoff technology can lead to advances in manufacturing, sciences, medical breakthroughs, and other valuable innovations.

I believe the Federal Government can play an important role in encouraging scientific research and development, but we must be prudent in our expenditure of funds and focus on those areas of research which provide the

greatest potential for improving the quality of life for our citizens.

If we had adequate resources, I would support funding the space station and the SSC. Unfortunately, we are dealing with fiscal limitations and constraints that require us to make tough choices about how we spend our limited Federal dollars. I cannot justify having the Federal Government fund either of these programs while we are struggling to cut \$500 billion over 5 years from our deficit and congressional leaders are discussing cuts in Medicare, which provides health care to our elderly citizens.

The fact of the matter is that we can no longer fund each and every project that is put before us. We must establish our priorities, and we must stick to those priorities until the deficit is brought under control.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, there is a difference between programs we should eliminate because they are a waste of the taxpayers' money and programs we should stop funding, perhaps only temporarily, because of the precarious financial situation we as a nation find ourselves in. Both the SSC and the space station fall into the latter category.

It is clear that we can not, at this point, continue to fund the space station or the SSC. For this reason, I support the amendment by Representatives SLATTERY and BOEHLERT and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to cut funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC], the Coppersmith-Sharp amendment to cut funding for the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR], and the Markey amendment to cut funding for the SP-100 space-based nuclear reactor.

Much like the vote to eliminate the space station, there are votes about saving the taxpayers' money and making tough choices on our Nation's budget priorities.

I agree with supporters of the SSC that scientific research is important and that examining the nature of the universe is a worthwhile endeavor. However, the economy and the deficit are far more important.

The SSC is a program whose cost has increased 90 percent over the last 3 years. It is a project that consumes proportionally more and more of our Nation's scientific research budget, much to the detriment of the more cost-efficient, small-scale basic research that is performed in thousands of labs by far more scientists than are involved in the SSC. It is a project that is too much, too soon.

In addition, as my colleagues know, last year, the House voted to end the SSC Program, but the project was revived in the other Chamber. It is my hope that this year the other body continues its recent trend of concentrating on spending cuts and eliminates the SSC.

I also plan to support the Coppersmith amendment to eliminate the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR]. First, I oppose the ALMR because it is not a national priority. Indeed, the Department of Energy rated the ALMR as number 21 out of 23 national research projects. Second, the ALMR increases the chances of nuclear proliferation because its nuclear fuel cycle uses plutonium, the basis of nuclear explosives. In the early 1980's, the

integral fast reactor program, the predecessor of the ALMR, was terminated for this very reason. Third, claims that the ALMR is important to private industry are dubious because the private sector has avoided the program and because there are more productive methods of nuclear waste disposal.

In the case of the SP-100, it is simply another project without a mission. The SP-100 was originally developed as a power source for star wars, and over time each Federal agency involved in the SP-1100 has turned its back on the projects. Like the SSC, the SP-100's costs have continually exceeded cost projections. Most important the administration has recommended terminating the program.

Mr. Chairman, in a perfect world with no budget deficit and a vibrant economy, we could afford projects that excite the explorer in all of us. However, we have a budget deficit and sluggish economy, and we simply cannot afford these projects.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA). All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 280, noes 150, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

#### AYES—280

Abercrombie	Conyers	Grandy
Allard	Cooper	Greenwood
Andrews (ME)	Coppersmith	Gunderson
Applegate	Costello	Gutierrez
Archer	Crane	Hall (OH)
Baessler	Danner	Hamburg
Baker (CA)	Deal	Hamilton
Ballenger	DeFazio	Hancock
Barca	DeLauro	Harman
Barcia	Dellums	Hastert
Barlow	Deutsch	Hefley
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Hefner
Barrett (WI)	Dingell	Herger
Becerra	Dooley	Hoagland
Bellenson	Doolittle	Hobson
Bereuter	Duncan	Hoekstra
Berman	Durbin	Hoke
Bilbray	Edwards (CA)	Holden
Bilirakis	Engel	Houghton
Bliley	English (AZ)	Huffington
Boehlert	English (OK)	Hughes
Brewster	Eshoo	Hutchinson
Brown (OH)	Evans	Hutto
Bunning	Ewing	Inglis
Burton	Farr	Inhofe
Byrne	Fawell	Inslee
Calvert	Filner	Istook
Camp	Fingerhut	Jacobs
Canady	Fish	Jefferson
Cantwell	Flake	Johnson (GA)
Cardin	Foglietta	Johnson (SD)
Carr	Ford (MI)	Johnston
Castle	Ford (TN)	Kanjorski
Clay	Fowler	Kaptur
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kennedy
Clement	Gedensson	Kennelly
Clinger	Gekas	Kildee
Clyburn	Gillmor	Kim
Coble	Gilman	King
Collins (GA)	Glickman	Kingston
Collins (IL)	Goodling	Klecza
Collins (MI)	Gordon	Klein
Condit	Goss	Klink

Klug	Nussle	Sisisky
Knollenberg	Oberstar	Skaggs
Kreidler	Obey	Slatery
Kyl	Oliver	Slaughter
LaFalce	Orton	Smith (MI)
Lambert	Owens	Smith (NJ)
Lancaster	Pallone	Smith (OR)
Lantos	Parker	Snowe
Lazio	Paxon	Solomon
Leach	Payne (NJ)	Spratt
Lehman	Pelosi	Stark
Levin	Penny	Stearns
Levy	Peterson (MN)	Stokes
Lewis (FL)	Petri	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Studds
Linder	Pomeroy	Stupak
Lipinski	Porter	Sundquist
Long	Portman	Swett
Machtley	Poshard	Swift
Maloney	Price (NC)	Talent
Mann	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
Manzullo	Quinn	Tauzin
Margolies-	Rahall	Taylor (MS)
Mezvinsky	Ramstad	Thomas (WY)
Markley	Rangel	Thornton
Martinez	Ravenel	Thurman
Mazzoli	Reed	Torkildsen
McCandless	Regula	Unsoeld
McCurdy	Richardson	Upton
McDermott	Ridge	Valentine
McHugh	Rohrabacher	Velazquez
McInnis	Rostenkowski	Vento
McKeon	Roth	Visclosky
McKinney	Roukema	Walker
McMillan	Rowland	Walsh
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Washington
Menendez	Royce	Waters
Meyers	Sabo	Watt
Mfume	Sanders	Waxman
Miller (CA)	Sangmeister	Weldon
Miller (FL)	Sawyer	Wheat
Minge	Saxton	Williams
Mink	Schroeder	Wise
Moakley	Schumer	Wolf
Molinari	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Montgomery	Serrano	Wyden
Morella	Sharp	Wynn
Murphy	Shaw	Young (FL)
Neal (MA)	Shays	Zeliff
Neal (NC)	Shepherd	Zimmer
Norton (DC)	Shuster	

## NOES—150

Ackerman	Dixon	Lewis (CA)
Andrews (NJ)	Dornan	Lightfoot
Andrews (TX)	Dreier	Livingston
Armedy	Dunn	Lloyd
Bacchus (FL)	Edwards (TX)	Lowey
Bachus (AL)	Emerson	Matsui
Baker (LA)	Everett	McCloskey
Bartlett	Fazio	McCollum
Barton	Fields (LA)	McCrery
Bateman	Fields (TX)	McDade
Bentley	Franks (CT)	McHale
Bevill	Franks (NJ)	McNulty
Bishop	Frost	Meek
Blackwell	Furse	Mica
Blute	Galleghy	Michel
Boehner	Gallo	Mineta
Bonilla	Gephardt	Mollohan
Bonior	Geren	Moorhead
Borski	Gibbons	Moran
Boucher	Gilchrest	Murtha
Brooks	Gingrich	Myers
Browder	Gonzalez	Nadler
Brown (CA)	Goodlatte	Natcher
Brown (FL)	Grams	Ortiz
Bryant	Green	Oxley
Buyer	Hall (TX)	Packard
Callahan	Hansen	Pastor
Chapman	Hastings	Payne (VA)
Coleman	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Combest	Hilliard	Pickett
Cox	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Coyne	Horn	Quillen
Cramer	Hoyer	Reynolds
Cruno	Hunter	Roberts
Cunningham	Hyde	Roemer
Darden	Johnson (CT)	Rogers
de la Garza	Johnson, E.B.	Romero-Barcelo
de Lugo (VI)	Johnson, Sam	(PR)
DeLay	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Derrick	Kopetski	Rose
Diaz-Balart	LaRocco	Rush
Dicks	Laughlin	Santorum

Sarpaluis	Stenholm	Underwood (GU)
Schaefer	Stump	Volkmer
Schenk	Taylor (NC)	Vucanovich
Schiff	Tejeda	Whitten
Scott	Thomas (CA)	Wilson
Skelton	Torres	Yates
Smith (IA)	Torricelli	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Towns	
Spence	Trafcant	

## NOT VOTING—9

Faleomavaega	Kasich	Thompson
(AS)	Manton	Tucker
Henry	Skeen	
Hinchey	Synar	

## □ 1709

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Tucker for, with Mr. Manton against.

Messrs. PASTOR, RUSH, and YATES changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. NORTON, and Messrs. ALLARD, MONTGOMERY, KLEIN, FARR of California, STOKES, and CLAY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

## □ 1710

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 38, line 19, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill through page 38, line 19, is as follows:

## TITLE IV

## INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

## APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, notwithstanding section 405 of said Act, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$189,000,000.

## DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$15,060,000, to remain available until expended.

## DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$333,000.

## CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$488,000.

## INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

## CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of its business in the conservancy district established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748), as amended by the Act of September 25, 1970 (Public Law 91-407), \$498,000.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, official representation expenses (not to exceed \$20,000); reimbursements to the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, \$542,900,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$22,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That from this appropriation, transfer of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Commission for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, including criminal history checks under section 149 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, may be retained and used for salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$520,900,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1994 from licensing fees, inspection services and other services and collections, excluding those moneys received for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$22,000,000.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provi-



sions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$4,800,000 to remain available until expended; and in addition, an amount not to exceed 5 percent of this sum may be transferred from Salaries and Expenses, Nuclear Regulatory Commission: *Provided*, That notice of such transfers shall be given to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1994 from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$2,160,000, to be transferred from the Nuclear Waste Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### OFFICE OF THE NUCLEAR WASTE NEGOTIATOR

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator in carrying out activities authorized by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended by Public Law 102-486, section 802, \$1,000,000 to remain available until expended.

#### SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission as authorized by law (84 Stat. 1541), \$308,000.

#### CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of Susquehanna River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (84 Stat. 1530, 1531), \$298,000.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C. ch. 12A), including purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$138,973,000, to remain available until expended.

#### UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

An amount not to exceed \$10,000,000 collected from foreign customers at the rate of \$5 per separative work unit shall be transferred by the United States Enrichment Corporation to the Department of Energy on

September 30, 1994; and, in addition, all collections in excess of \$10,000,000 shall be credited to this appropriation.

#### TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISION

##### MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

SEC. 501. (a) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 304 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-377; 106 Stat. 1339) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—  
(A) by striking "owned or controlled" and inserting "that (1) are owned and controlled";

(B) by inserting after "Native Americans" the following: "; or (2) are small business concerns that are at least 51 percent owned by 1 or more women and whose management and daily business operations are controlled by 1 or more women"; and

(C) by striking the last sentence;  
(2) by inserting "and (d)" after "(6) each place it appears; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—

"(1) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A business concern or other organization shall be eligible for participation under this section only if it has been certified as meeting the requirements specified in subsection (a) by the Small Business Administration, or by a State, local, regional, or other organization designated by the Small Business Administration.

"(2) RECORDS AND REPORTS.—The Secretary of Energy, with respect to the Superconducting Super Collider project, shall—

"(A) submit to the Congress copies of—  
(i) each subcontracting report for individual contracts (SF294) required under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR chapter 1) to be submitted by a contractor or subcontractor with respect to the project; and

(ii) each summary subcontract report (SF295) required under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR chapter 1) to be submitted by a contractor or subcontractor with respect to the project; and

"(B) maintain accurate information and data on the amount and type of subcontracts awarded by each contractor or subcontractor under the project and the extent of participation in the subcontracts by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals and economically disadvantaged women referred to in subsection (b).

"(3) CATEGORIES OF WORK TO BE INCLUDED.—The Secretary of Energy shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure that the categories of work performed under contracts entered into pursuant to this section are representative of all categories of work performed under contract for the Superconducting Super Collider project.

"(4) AUDITS.—The Secretary of Energy shall conduct periodic audits to verify the continuing compliance of prime contractors and subcontractors with the requirements of this section. For such purpose, the Secretary shall have access to such reports and records of prime contractors and subcontractors as the Secretary determines to be necessary."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to fiscal year 1994 and thereafter.

##### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order on the energy

and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2445, regarding language in title IV, on page 35, lines 17 through 25, inclusive.

Mr. Chairman, this is violative of the rule against legislating in an appropriation bill. This provision, which is entitled "United States Enrichment Corporation Fund," is legislation in an appropriation bill, in violation of rule XXI, clause 2, of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this provision directs the corporation to collect \$10 million from its foreign customers at a specified rate and to transfer the funds to the Department of Energy, DOE, on September 30, 1994.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HUGHES). For the reasons advanced by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the point of order is sustained.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment at the conclusion of the reading, and I shall not, in the interest of time and a speedy conclusion. I would like, however, to suggest what the amendment was and engage in a brief colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

The amendment would have prohibited funding nearly \$2 million for what is called PLYWHD, the precision low yield warehouse design. I can sum that up by suggesting that these are called mini- or micronukes, the Uzis of the nuclear weapons arsenal.

There is no need for these, Mr. Chairman, and indeed they would send the wrong message to many people.

Let me talk briefly about three issues that concern me if we were to develop these mininukes. There is currently a law against testing new weapons in this country, so that any money we might spend would be wasted, because if a weapon were developed, we could never be sure of its efficacy without testing, and I hope we would not change the law against new testing.

Second, these weapons are intended to be used against personnel in the field or in combat situations, indeed, used against the very Third World nation forces who we are now trying to convince to stop nuclear proliferation. It would send the wrong signal.

One, it would not work; two, it would send the wrong signal to the very nations that we are trying to convince not to expand their nuclear weaponry.

It is the opinion of this gentleman and the purpose of the amendment that the development of low-yield nuclear weapons by the United States or any other country which this would encourage should be strongly discouraged. It is my hope that the authorizing committee will seek to eliminate this, or that the other body may not indeed authorize the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to inquire of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], that had I offered this amendment, if the gentleman might have found it meritorious and been inclined to support it?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I certainly commend the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] for his amendment. I think it has a lot of merit, and I do appreciate the gentleman not offering it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I know there is one other gentleman in the Chamber who appreciates my not offering it because he would oppose it. I would like to yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of Members that I will not seek additional time because both of us are aware of everyone's schedule this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I would have opposed the amendment had it been offered, because had it been offered, it might have precluded the briefing of the Nuclear Weapons Council on the study that the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] referred to.

There has been great interest in studying options for low yield nuclear weapons for precision strikes such as strikes against deeply buried targets.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] indicated, there was no money last year, there is no money this year, and there will be no money next year. So an amendment that would have excluded the expenditure of money for this purpose is really unnecessary, and, therefore, I do not think we need to spend any additional time on the matter.

Had the amendment been offered, I would have opposed it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, as I say, \$2 million may not be a lot of money, but it certainly in this bill would have been an ounce of prevention.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to titles IV and V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 38, after line 19, add the following new sections:

#### SEC. 502. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

#### SEC. 503. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be author-

ized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

#### SEC. 504. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is a buy-American amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, we are familiar with this amendment, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has discussed this amendment with us. With the exception of the last section, it has been in the law before. We accept it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the cooperation of the House in accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1994".

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2445, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994. This legislation will help move the country forward in the areas of energy, environment, and transportation. For their work on this legislation, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking Republican, Mr. MYERS.

H.R. 2445 specifically addresses some of the most pressing needs in my district. The bill provides \$475,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers to revise the hurricane protection plan for the south shore of Staten Island. Staten Island's south shore has been pounded by two

majors storms in the last 8 months. Hundreds of homes were devastated when a northeaster hit New York in early December 1992. I appreciate the committee's recognition of the need to protect the thousands of families that reside in the south shore community.

The Howland-Hook Marine Terminal is one of Staten Island's most promising economic development opportunities. Unfortunately, the facility has been vacant for several years. Now the New York-New Jersey Port Authority is ready to place a new tenant in the facility. H.R. 2445 provides \$500,000 for a study to dredge the channel to Howland-Hook Marine Terminal. With this funding, we will be able to assure the new tenant that even the largest container ships will be able to use the Howland-Hook Terminal.

The legislation also provides \$2.9 million for the New York Harbor collection and removal of drift project. These funds will be used to collect rotting piers before they break apart and become a navigational hazard for ships in the harbor. These funds will be used for Shooters Island and the southwest Brooklyn waterfront. The project also helps keep this debris off New York and New Jersey beaches.

While I respect the work of the committee on this legislation, I was heartened that the House voted to remove the costly superconducting super collider. Our Nation's growing deficit makes this a project we cannot now afford to proceed with.

Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking Republican for their work on this excellent bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, with our annual Federal deficits and looming national debt all elements of the budget will require belt tightening. The belt tightening must extend to all appropriation bills and will require the various appropriation subcommittees to set priorities.

It is within this context that I would like to discuss the energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 which funds hundreds of energy and water related projects. This \$22 billion bill is reported to be \$126 million less than last year's bill. Although I do not want to get into the debate here of whether the bill could be reduced even further, I do want to discuss the priorities in the bill. In particular, I was disappointed that the legislation did not contain funding for the Des Plaines wetlands demonstration project in Wadsworth, IL, a project which the committee has funded in the past.

I believe the Des Plaines wetlands project is of significant importance to our understanding of wetlands and our environment. Scientists involved with the project are demonstrating how wetlands can not only be restored, but create in such places as abandoned farm lands and gravel pits. This is a proven project, and Don Hey, the project's director, and his staff have worked tirelessly in their efforts to fully understand the nature of wetlands. Their efforts have convinced me that this research will derive significant long-term benefits for all those concerned about preservation, restoration, and creation of wetland areas. Indeed, the Des Plaines wetlands project will help bridge the gap between development and environmental protection by showing us how wetlands can be created to replace wetland areas deemed necessary for commercial or residential development.



The Des Plaines project receives funding from local, State, and private sources; however, the project relies heavily on funds contributed by Federal agencies involved with the project. Although I realize that we are dealing with limited funds, I had hoped that this project would have been funded in light of its environmental contributions. In any event, I urge my Senate colleagues to support this project, and urge those House Members who may be on the conference committee to reconsider their position on this matter.

Mr. PACKARD. Chairman, as we consider the fiscal year 1994 energy and water appropriations bill this morning, I would like to commend the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, TOM BEVILL and the ranking republican, JOHN MYERS for their hard work and diligence on this legislation. They have put together a tight bill, below the administration's request that I feel this House can comfortably support.

I would also like to thank my colleague VIC FAZIO for his efforts on behalf of projects in this legislation for my area and for California.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 2445, the fiscal year 1994 energy and water appropriations bill. I would like to commend Chairman BEVILL and ranking minority member Mr. MYERS for their fine work in bringing this fiscally responsible bill to the House floor.

Although H.R. 2445 contains many worthy provisions, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a project contained in the bill of particular importance to the people who reside in New Jersey's Middlesex, Somerset, and Union Counties. The project to which I refer is called the Green Brook flood control project.

As my colleagues may recall, this project was authorized by Congress under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, section 401. During the past 8 fiscal years, Congress has appropriated over \$14 million for this project. In fiscal year 1986, Congress appropriated \$484,000; in fiscal year 1987, \$1.37 million; fiscal year 1988, \$1.4 million; fiscal year 1989, \$1.5 million; fiscal year 1990, \$1.2 million; fiscal year 1991, \$2 million; fiscal year 1992, \$3.169 million; and fiscal year 1993, \$3.5 million. For fiscal year 1994, the House is providing \$2.8 million to continue the following tasks: preconstruction engineering and design—including hydraulic and hydrologic analysis—environmental investigations and data collection; topographic mapping; and layout of levee alignments.

Completion of this project is vital if we are to prevent the enormous damage that another flood could bring. My colleagues may recall the great flood of 1973 that occurred in what is now largely the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey. This flood claimed the lives of six people and caused tens of millions of dollars in damage. I would venture that if a similar flood occurred today, the damage could exceed \$1 billion dollars.

That flood, coupled with an earlier one that occurred in 1971, provided the impetus for the Green Brook flood control project. Since this project is so encompassing, we must proceed now before another devastating flood arrives. It has been almost 20 years to the day since the last great flood in this area, and it is only

a matter of time before such a flood occurs again. Completion of this project ensures that this area will be adequately prepared for such an event.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to thank my good friend and fellow New Jersey colleague, Congressman DEAN GALLO, for his assistance and guidance on this project. This project's success is due in large part to DEAN's tireless work as a member of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee. Another individual who richly deserves recognition for their efforts on behalf of this project is Vernon A. Noble, the chairman of the Green Brook Flood Control Commission. Because of Vernon's leadership and tenacity, I am confident this project will be brought to fruition.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on H.R. 2445, and to vote "no" on any weakening amendments.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the continued construction funding in this bill for the St. Paul flood control project. I especially want to thank Chairman BEVILL and the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for their continuing support of this worthy project.

The bill provides \$3.6 million for continued construction of the St. Paul flood control project. The total estimated Federal cost for this project of \$11.3 million is to be leveraged against \$8.9 million in local cost sharing.

This project is located directly across the Mississippi River from downtown St. Paul. The project will raise the existing 3-mile flood barrier by 4 feet which includes the flood control features of 1,335 feet of raised floodwalls, 2,400 feet of stepped floodwalls, 12,280 feet of levees, six closures, upgrades of three pumping stations, with additional recreational trails and associated features which benefit from these necessary flood control features.

The existing flood barrier protects 448 acres which are prone to flooding. In 1965, and again in 1969, this area experienced major floods which exceeded the previous record flood of 1952.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is particularly timely in light of recent heavy rainfall in western and central Minnesota which has raised the levels of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers significantly. The Mississippi is expected to reach flood crest level, based upon current rainfall, sometime Saturday in St. Paul and yet more rain is expected. This recent and continuing rainfall underscores the importance of proper flood control planning which is exemplified in this legislation. It also highlights the important work being done by the men and women of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers St. Paul district office. Their important work in forecasting floods and making preparations for these situations is vital to the residents and businesses in these affected areas.

I also want to recognize and express my appreciation for the inclusion in this bill of \$2.4 million for the Stillwater flood control project on the St. Croix River in Stillwater, MN. The original levee built in 1937 has suffered extensive deterioration due to ice and spring runoffs to the extent that some 200 feet of the original levee has washed away, thus threatening the

remaining floodwall. A failure of this floodwall would pose serious harm to downtown Stillwater, Minnesota's oldest community; in the event of a flood failure and serious environmental consequences for the St. Croix River with possible discharges of sewage and other debris into this National Park Service designated scenic river. I support this effort to address this problem now to rehabilitate and repair the Stillwater floodwall before it becomes a more serious and expensive problem in the future.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, an examination of H.R. 2445, the energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1994, reveals a disturbing fact. The bill provides \$6.2 billion for environmental cleanup of Department of Energy nuclear research sites, despite the fact that the Department has not proven itself capable of performing this important task.

Despite its recommendation for this multi-billion-dollar appropriation, the Appropriations Committee reports that it is concerned about the increasing costs of the environmental restoration and waste management program, the apparent lack of significant progress in cleanup activities, and the Department of Energy's failure thus far to comply with a requirement for an annual report on program expenditures and accomplishments. The committee apparently sees no relationship between program success and resource allocation. I think they have it backward.

I strongly support the cleanup of nuclear research sites, but I oppose poor management and wasteful Government spending. Congress deserves assurances on the part of the committee and the Department of Energy that this program will be goal oriented and an accountable one.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Slattery-Boehlert amendment and in strong support of the superconducting super collider (SSC). We are at a crossroads in modern physics; today we have a choice of whether we will continue to move forward in scientific research in this country or whether we will simply stop and leave so many important scientific questions unanswered. I know many of my colleagues will argue that this project costs too much, that we simply cannot afford to fund the SSC. To the contrary, the SSC is so important that we simply cannot afford not to fund it.

The problem, of course with science is that it always yields as many new questions as it does answers. As a nation, we have always striven to find the answers to the increasingly difficult and complex questions science has presented us. To stop our search for the answers to profound questions would only serve to relegate the United States out of its position as a world leader in scientific research and discovery. We are a superpower, the only one left in the world; we cannot relinquish leadership in the field of science.

Our children cannot afford to have their knowledge of the universe to be stifled because we decided we could not afford to continue to ask the simple question "why?" and then seek to answer that question. On the basis of pure science alone, I say to my colleagues that this is a meritorious project which deserves our support. I believe the United States should continue to lead the world in scientific research.

I understand that pure research science is not of interest to everyone and therefore appeal to my colleagues for their continued support for the SSC not on the grounds of pure scientific knowledge; rather on the many practical benefits the project has had and is expected to yield with continued research. We know from our experience with NASA that the research involved in designing the components for the SSC will yield many technological advances which have practical applications in every aspect of our daily lives. Continued research will improve our quality of life. How do I know this? Let me share with you some of the breakthroughs which have already been achieved which will benefit us all.

The field of medicine has benefited enormously from superconductivity research. Superconducting magnets are now being used in both magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] and computerized axial tomography [CAT] scans, which have greatly improved doctors' ability to diagnose medical problems. Indeed, I am sure every Member of this body is personally acquainted with someone who has benefited from these techniques. It is expected that superconducting wire, being developed for the SSC, will improve efficiency and reduce the costs of these diagnostic techniques. Additionally, the SSC site is expected to have a proton therapy clinic on site in order to treat cancer patients.

I urge all Members to consider how beneficial this new treatment will be for those who suffer from cancer.

Commercially there are numerous benefits. Information technology has and will continue to benefit from continued funding of the SSC. The computing needs of the project have led to the development of ultrafast computing systems. These systems can process literally thousands of pieces of data every second and can perform numerous tasks simultaneously.

Advances of this type have myriad applications, including education and the dissemination of information. The new computing capabilities are expected to facilitate the entry of high performance electronics into the commercial marketplace. Moreover, transportation will be revolutionized by the advent of magnetically levitated trains and magnetically propelled ships, making transportation far more energy efficient.

Finally, scientists have developed a reconfiguration assembly system. Manufacturing industries will now be able to reconfigure their production lines quickly in order to respond to changes in the market. In this era of increasing competition in the world marketplace, this technology is essential to keep American industries at the forefront and provide American workers with highly skilled, highly paid jobs. Given the level of competition in the world market, we cannot afford to relinquish our technological advantage to others.

I am reminded of the saying "Penny wise, Pound foolish" and I think it is important that we remember to balance the supposed saving today against the cost of lost competitive and technological advantage, and job opportunities for our children's future.

I support the SSC and urge my colleagues to defeat the Slattery-Boehlert amendment.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2445, a bill making fis-

cal year 1994 appropriations for energy and water development.

I congratulate the gentleman and my longtime friend from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], as well as my friend from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for doing yeoman's work given very difficult budget constraints.

H.R. 2445 includes funding for three programs of much importance of my community of Louisville and Jefferson County, KY.

The bill provides \$2.18 million for the continuation of preconstruction and engineering design work on a 1,200-foot lock at the McAlpine Locks and Dam on the Ohio River. Upon completion of this 6-year modernization project, an antiquated 600-foot lock and an inactive 360-foot lock will be replaced by twin 1,200 locks and make possible the uninterrupted flow of barge traffic along the Ohio.

Appropriations are also recommended for two much needed flood control projects in Louisville and Jefferson County: \$300,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Metropolitan Louisville Beargrass Creek flood control project; and, \$1.25 million to begin the preengineering and design phase of the Metropolitan Louisville Pond Creek flood control project. Both projects will provide protection for many homes and businesses in Louisville and Jefferson County.

Mr. Chairman, maintaining funding for these projects is critical, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2445.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Energy and Water appropriations bill because it represents the culmination of untold hours of work by countless Utahns to authorize and fund a program that has become synonymous with growth and vitality in my desert State of Utah: the Central Utah Water project.

The CUP is the most important water conservation and development project in Utah's history. It will ensure that Utah's families retain their fair share of water rights from the Colorado River, while enabling Utah to protect its unmatched fish and wildlife resources through unprecedented environmental mitigation programs.

I want to point out that this remarkable legislative achievement can only be described as a hallmark piece of the legislative legacy of my predecessor in the House: Wayne Owens. Make no mistake, we would never have succeeded in passing and funding the CUP without Wayne's tireless efforts, and he deserves the heartfelt thanks of every Utahn today.

Let me also thank Chairman TOM BEVILL, whose vision and leadership has permitted this critical initiative to move forward. I deeply appreciate the chairman's assistance in this effort, and I applaud him for his work in crafting this important bill.

Funding for the CUP will enable Utah's economy to grow with vigor as we enter the 21st century. I thank my fellow Utah Representatives Mr. ORTON and Mr. HANSEN for their assistance in this effort, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support the energy and water appropriations bill.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Slattery-Boehlert amendment which would terminate the superconducting super collider [SSC].

I recognize that the SSC is a challenging and costly project, but I also realize that the scientific data gained from the SSC will give our scientists the technological superiority necessary as we head into the 21st century.

The SSC will provide vital research in the areas of science and medicine. I believe the potential long-term benefits of the SSC far outweigh the immediate costs of the program. Over the years, research conducted in high-energy physics has significantly advanced our knowledge of fields important to all Americans, such as atomic medicine and superconductivity. And again, the SSC is a vital component in our Nation's drive to remain technologically competitive in a global economy.

The SSC is a large and ambitious project during a difficult fiscal time. Like other ambitious research projects in our Nation's history, the super collider is challenging our industrial, scientific, and technological capabilities. I believe it is through such challenges that technological progress is made. We must not lose sight of our responsibility to invest in programs today which will prepare us for the competitive environment of tomorrow.

If we vote to terminate the SSC project today, I believe we place U.S. scientific leadership in extreme jeopardy. Many of our Nation's leading physicists have indicated that they will not hesitate to take their research to Europe if the SSC is canceled.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the significant importance of the SSC project. Please vote against the Slattery-Boehlert amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1720

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HUGHES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that we have a separate vote on the Coppersmith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment, the Markey-



Ramstad-Penny-Machtley amendment, and the Slattery-Boehlert amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair intend, if votes are ordered on the next two amendments, to reduce them to 5 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair intends to do that, if the votes are ordered.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for being so reasonable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 20, line 9, strike "\$3,224,534,000" and insert "\$3,192,634,000".

Mr. SOLOMON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that subsequent votes on the other amendments, if ordered, will be 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 272, noes 146, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

#### AYES—272

Abercrombie	Byrne	Deutsch
Ackerman	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Allard	Cantwell	Dickey
Andrews (ME)	Cardin	Dicks
Andrews (TX)	Castle	Dixon
Bacchus (FL)	Clay	Dooley
Baessler	Clayton	Doolittle
Ballenger	Clyburn	Duncan
Barca	Coble	Dunn
Barcia	Collins (GA)	Edwards (CA)
Barlow	Collins (IL)	Edwards (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Engel
Becerra	Condit	English (AZ)
Berman	Conyers	English (OK)
Bishop	Cooper	Eshoo
Blackwell	Coppersmith	Evans
Blute	Costello	Farr
Boehlert	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Borski	Danner	Filner
Boucher	Darden	Fingerhut
Brewster	Deal	Fish
Brown (CA)	DeFazio	Flake
Brown (OH)	DeLauro	Foglietta
Bryant	Dellums	Ford (MI)
Bunning	Derrick	Ford (TN)

Fowler	Lowey	Roukema
Frank (MA)	Machtley	Rowland
Franks (CT)	Maloney	Royal-Allard
Furse	Mann	Royce
Gedjenson	Margolies-	Rush
Geren	Mezvisinsky	Sabo
Glichrest	Markey	Sanders
Gillmor	Martinez	Santorum
Gilman	Mazzoli	Sarpallius
Glickman	McCandless	Sawyer
Goodlatte	McCloskey	Saxton
Goodling	McCurdy	Schenk
Gordon	McDermott	Schroeder
Grandy	McHale	Schumer
Greenwood	McInnis	Scott
Gutierrez	McKinney	Sensenbrenner
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Serrano
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Sharp
Hamburg	Menendez	Shays
Hamilton	Meyers	Shepherd
Harman	Mfume	Sisisky
Hastings	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Hefley	Minge	Skelton
Hefner	Mink	Slattery
Herger	Moakley	Slaughter
Hoagland	Molinar	Smith (MI)
Hobson	Montgomery	Smith (NJ)
Hoekstra	Moran	Snowe
Hoke	Morella	Spratt
Holden	Murphy	Stark
Hughes	Nadler	Stearns
Hutto	Neal (MA)	Stenholm
Inglis	Neal (NC)	Stokes
Inhofe	Nussle	Studds
Jacobs	Oberstar	Stupak
Jefferson	Obey	Sundquist
Johnson (GA)	Oliver	Swett
Johnson (SD)	Ortiz	Talent
Johnson, Sam	Orton	Tanner
Johnston	Owens	Tauzin
Kanjorski	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Kaptur	Parker	Thornton
Kennedy	Paxon	Thurman
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Torkildsen
Kim	Payne (VA)	Torres
King	Pelosi	Towns
Klecza	Penny	Unsoeld
Klein	Peterson (MN)	Upton
Klink	Petri	Valentine
Klug	Pomeroy	Velazquez
Kopetski	Poshard	Vento
Kreidler	Price (NC)	Walsh
Kyl	Pryce (OH)	Washington
LaFalce	Quillen	Waters
Lambert	Rahall	Watt
Lancaster	Ramstad	Waxman
Lantos	Rangel	Weldon
Laughlin	Ravenel	Wheat
Lazio	Reed	Williams
Lehman	Regula	Wise
Levin	Reynolds	Woolsey
Levy	Richardson	Wyden
Lewis (GA)	Ridge	Wynn
Linder	Roemer	Young (FL)
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Zeliff
Long	Roth	Zimmer

#### NOES—146

Applegate	Chapman	Gonzalez
Archer	Clement	Goss
Bachus (AL)	Clinger	Grams
Baker (CA)	Coleman	Green
Baker (LA)	Combust	Gunderson
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Hancock
Bartlett	Crane	Hansen
Barton	Crapo	Hastert
Bateman	de la Garza	Hayes
Bentley	DeLay	Hilliard
Bereuter	Dornan	Hochbrueckner
Bevill	Dreier	Horn
Bilbray	Durbin	Houghton
Billrakis	Emerson	Hoyer
Bliley	Everett	Huffington
Boehner	Ewing	Hunter
Bonilla	Fawell	Hutchinson
Bonior	Fazio	Hyde
Brooks	Fields (TX)	Inalee
Browder	Franks (NJ)	Istook
Brown (FL)	Frost	Johnson (CT)
Burton	Gallely	Johnson, E. B.
Buyer	Gallo	Kildee
Callahan	Gekas	Kingston
Camp	Gephardt	Knollenberg
Canady	Gibbons	Kolbe
Carr	Gingrich	LaRocco

Leach	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Lewis (FL)	Packard	Solomon
Lightfoot	Pastor	Spence
Livingston	Peterson (FL)	Strickland
Lloyd	Pickett	Stump
Manzullo	Pickle	Swift
Matsui	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
McCollum	Porter	Tejeda
McCrery	Portman	Thomas (CA)
McDade	Quinn	Thomas (WY)
McHugh	Roberts	Torricelli
McKeon	Rogers	Trafficant
McMillan	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
Meek	Rose	Volkmer
Mica	Rostenkowski	Vucanovich
Michel	Sangmeister	Walker
Mineta	Schaefer	Whitten
Mollohan	Schiff	Wilson
Moorhead	Shaw	Wolf
Murtha	Shuster	Yates
Myers	Smith (IA)	Young (AK)
Natcher	Smith (OR)	

#### NOT VOTING—16

Andrews (NJ)	Henry	Skeen
Armey	Hinchey	Synar
Beilenson	Kasich	Thompson
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Tucker
Cunningham	Manton	
Dingell	Miller (CA)	

□ 1742

Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. EVERETT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 20, line 9, strike "\$3,224,534,000" and insert "\$3,199,534,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 329, noes 91, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

#### AYES—329

Abercrombie	Bonior	Coble
Ackerman	Borski	Collins (GA)
Allard	Boucher	Collins (IL)
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Collins (MI)
Andrews (TX)	Brown (CA)	Condit
Andrews (TX)	Brown (OH)	Conyers
Applegate	Bryant	Cooper
Baessler	Bunning	Coppersmith
Baker (LA)	Burton	Costello
Ballenger	Buyer	Coyne
Barca	Byrne	Crane
Barcia	Camp	Danner
Barlow	Canady	Darden
Barrett (NE)	Cantwell	Deal
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	DeFazio
Becerra	Carr	DeLauro
Berman	Castle	Dellums
Bilbray	Clay	Derrick
Bishop	Clayton	Deutsch
Blackwell	Clement	Dickey
Blute	Clinger	Dicks
Boehlert	Clyburn	Dingell

Dixon Knollenberg  
Dooley Kolbe  
Doolittle Kopetski  
Duncan Kreidler  
Dunn LaFalce  
Durbin Lambert  
Edwards (TX) Lancaster  
Engel Lantos  
English (AZ) LaRocco  
English (OK) Laughlin  
Eshoo Lazio  
Evans Leach  
Ewing Lehman  
Farr Levin  
Fawell Lewis (GA)  
Fazio Linder  
Fields (LA) Lipinski  
Filner Lloyd  
Fingerhut Long  
Fish Lowey  
Flake Machtley  
Foglietta Maloney  
Ford (MI) Mann  
Ford (TN) Manzullo  
Frank (MA) Margolies-  
Franks (CT) Mezvinsky  
Furse Markey  
Gallegly Martinez  
Gejdenson Matsui  
Gekas Mazzoli  
Gephardt McCandless  
Geren McCloskey  
Gibbons McCreery  
Gilchrist McCurdy  
Gillmor McDermott  
Gilman McHale  
Glickman McHugh  
Goodlatte McInnis  
Goodling McKinney  
Gordon McMillan  
Goss McNulty  
Grandy Meehan  
Green Menendez  
Greenwood Meyers  
Gunderson Mfume  
Gutierrez Miller (CA)  
Hall (OH) Miller (FL)  
Hamburg Minge  
Hamilton Mink  
Hancock Moakley  
Harman Molinari  
Hastert Montgomery  
Hefley Moran  
Hefner Morella  
Herger Murphy  
Hoagland Nadler  
Hobson Neal (MA)  
Hoekstra Neal (NC)  
Hoke Oberstar  
Holden Obey  
Hoyer Oliver  
Huffington Ortiz  
Hughes Orton  
Hunter Owens  
Hutchinson Pallone  
Hutto Parker  
Ingilis Pastor  
Inhofe Paxon  
Istook Payne (NJ)  
Jacobs Payne (VA)  
Jefferson Pelosi  
Johnson (CT) Penny  
Johnson (GA) Peterson (FL)  
Johnson (SD) Peterson (MN)  
Johnson, Sam Petri  
Johnston Pickle  
Kanjorski Pombo  
Kaptur Pomeroy  
Kennedy Porter  
Kennelly Portman  
Kildee Poshard  
Kim Price (NC)  
Kingston Pryce (OH)  
Klecicka Quillen  
Klein Quinn  
Klink Rahall  
Klug Ramstad

## NOES—91

Archer Barton  
Bacchus (FL) Bateman  
Bacchus (AL) Bentley  
Baker (CA) Bereuter  
Bartlett Beville

Bilirakis  
Billie  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Brooks

Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Callahan  
Chapman  
Coleman  
Combest  
Cramer  
Crapo  
de la Garza  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Edwards (CA)  
Emerson  
Everett  
Fields (TX)  
Fowler  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Gallo  
Gingrich  
Gonzalez  
Grams  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Hilliard  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Johnson, E. B.  
King  
Kyl  
Levy  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Livingston  
McCollum  
McDade  
McKeon  
Meek  
Mica  
Michel  
Mineta  
Mollohan  
Moorhead  
Murtha  
Myers  
Natcher

Armey  
Bellenson  
Calvert  
Cunningham

## NOT VOTING—14

Henry  
Hinchey  
Kasich  
Lewis (CA)  
Manton  
Skeen  
Synar  
Thompson  
Tucker

## □ 1751

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Tucker for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Mr. Manton for, with Mr. Armey against.

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. TEJEDA changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 21, line 16, strike "\$1,594,114,000" and insert \$1,194,114,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There will be additional votes following, and Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 280, noes 141, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

## AYES—280

Abercrombie  
Allard  
Andrews (ME)  
Applegate  
Archer  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Ballenger  
Barca  
Barcia  
Barlow  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bibray  
Bilirakis  
Blackwell  
Bliley  
Boehler  
Brewster

Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
Costello  
Crane  
Danner  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Duncan  
Durbin  
Edwards (CA)  
Engel  
English (AZ)  
English (OK)  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fawell  
Filner  
Fingerhut  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Glickman  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Grandy  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Houghton  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Ingilis  
Inhofe  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Santorum  
Sargallus  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schenk  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sharp  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Snowe  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stupak  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Swift  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas (WY)  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Towns  
Unsoeld  
Upton  
Valentine  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walsh  
Washington  
Watt  
Waters  
Waxman  
Wheat  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOES—141

Ackerman  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Bacchus (FL)  
Bacchus (AL)  
Baker (LA)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bentley  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Blute  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brooks  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Chapman  
Coleman  
Combest  
Cox  
Coyne



Cramer	Hochbrueckner	Pastor
Crapo	Horn	Payne (VA)
Cunningham	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Darden	Hunter	Pickett
de la Garza	Hyde	Pickle
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Quillen
Derrick	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Dixon	Kolbe	Roemer
Dornan	Kopetski	Rogers
Dreier	LaRocco	Ros-Lehtinen
Dunn	Laughlin	Rose
Edwards (TX)	Lightfoot	Rush
Emerson	Livingston	Santorum
Everett	Lloyd	Sarpalius
Fazio	Lowey	Schaefer
Fields (LA)	Matsui	Schenk
Fields (TX)	McCloskey	Schiff
Franks (CT)	McCollum	Scott
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Skelton
Frost	McDade	Smith (IA)
Furse	McHale	Smith (TX)
Galleghy	McNulty	Spence
Gallo	Meek	Stenholm
Gephardt	Mica	Stump
Gibbons	Michel	Taylor (NC)
Gilchrest	Mineta	Tejeda
Gingrich	Mollohan	Thomas (CA)
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Torres
Goodlatte	Moran	Torricelli
Grams	Murtha	Towns
Green	Myers	Trafficant
Hall (TX)	Nader	Volkmer
Hansen	Natcher	Whitten
Hastings	Ortiz	Wilson
Hayes	Oxley	Yates
Hilliard	Packard	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—13

Armey	Kasich	Synar
Beilenson	Lewis (CA)	Thompson
Calvert	Manton	Tucker
Henry	McHugh	
Hinchey	Skeen	

□ 1759

The Clerk announced the following pair:

In this vote:

Mr. Tucker for, with Mr. Manton against.

Mr. DIXON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader about the program for next week. If we can keep ourselves in order, we can do it tout suite, in a hurry.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I will be very, very brief. I know that Members want to leave.

We will have votes on Monday. There will be a vote, I am told, on the rule that will occur about 1:30 on Monday. The next vote after that will occur about 3 o'clock.

We have the VA-HUD bill. We will have some suspensions. But the votes will be postponed until Tuesday.

Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday we will have a number of appropriation bills. We will finish Thursday night.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

The WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLF moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2445, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same to the House with the following amendment:

On page 38, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act this is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is simple and straightforward. It applies a 1-percent reduction to programs in this bill.

This motion takes into consideration that this body just achieved savings of \$400 million by agreeing to the termination of the super conducting supercollider and achieves additional savings of \$200 million through a modest 1-percent reduction.

Clearly, this is not a meat ax approach. There is not a program in here that could not absorb a 1-percent cut. There is not a program or activity funded by this bill that will even feel the pinch.

Mr. Speaker, overall, I think this bill is a good one. The subcommittee had done a commendable job staying within its section 602(b) allocation.

My issue is not with whether or not this subcommittee is at its allocation, my issue is with total spending above the 1993 enacted level. And this bill was above 1993 outlays by \$166 million, prior to the last vote.

Mr. Speaker, while this might not seem like such a big deal, it becomes a big one when you start adding up all 13 appropriations bills.

By the time all 13 bills are passed, we will have increased spending by \$3.8 billion over 1993.

I just do not believe this level of spending is what we can afford as a Nation.

When the full appropriations committee considered the section 602(b) al-

locations for each of its subcommittees, the ranking Republican members offered an alternative allocation that would have saved \$10.2 billion in budget authority and \$4.6 billion in outlays during the upcoming fiscal year.

Obviously, that alternative was not agreed to.

This motion to recommit is consistent with the alternative allocation offered by the Republicans and represents, overall, a reduction of less than 3 percent below the 1993 enacted levels.

Mr. Speaker, even after this motion to recommit, funding for the non-defense programs will increase by almost 9 percent above the 1993 enacted levels.

The reason the nondefense numbers are so high is because the subcommittee took savings of \$1.2 billion from the defense programs in this bill and applied them to the nondefense programs.

As the bill appears before us now, nondefense programs are up by \$600 million over 1993.

I am not here to debate the merits of defense versus nondefense spending. What I am here to say is that, on a day when the other body is debating by how much to raise taxes, we ought to take this one step toward reducing spending first.

We are just talking about tightening our belts by one notch.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of my motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit. I point out that we have added tremendously already with these three amendments to the cuts.

I just want to remind the House of what it will do to navigation, which is exports, which is jobs, what it will do to the flood control projects, what it will do to the local Governments that have to raise more money to participate.

I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 350, noes 73, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—350

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Applegate  
Bacchus (FL)  
Bacchus (AL)  
Baesler  
Ballenger  
Barca  
Barcia  
Barlow  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bishop  
Blackwell  
Billey  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Brooks  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Byrne  
Callahan  
Camp  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carr  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
Darden  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Durbin  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (AZ)  
English (OK)  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing

Farr  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Fingerhut  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gilman  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Grams  
Grandy  
Green  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hilliard  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Istook  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klein  
Klink  
Kolbe  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lehman  
Levin  
Levy  
Lewis (GA)

Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowey  
Machtley  
Maloney  
Mann  
Margolies-  
Mezvinsky  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCrery  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Santorum

Sarpalius  
Sawyer  
Schaefer  
Schenk  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe

Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stupak  
Swett  
Swift  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Tejeda  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Unsoeld  
Upton

NOES—73

Archer  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bilirakis  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Burton  
Buyer  
Canady  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Franks (CT)  
Gekas  
Gillmor

Gingrich  
Goss  
Greenwood  
Hancock  
Hoke  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Ingalls  
Inhofe  
Jacobs  
Johnson, Sam  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Lewis (FL)  
Manzullo  
McCollum  
McKeon  
McMillan  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Moorhead  
Murphy  
Neal (NC)

Oxley  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pombo  
Portman  
Quillen  
Ramstad  
Roberts  
Roth  
Royce  
Saxton  
Sensenbrenner  
Smith (MI)  
Solomon  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Torkildsen  
Walker  
Wolf  
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—11

Armey  
Calvert  
Henry  
Hinchey

Kasich  
Lewis (CA)  
Manton  
Skeen

Synar  
Thompson  
Tucker

□ 1818

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Manton for, with Mr. Thompson against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Armey against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall votes 265, 266, 267, and 268. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall Nos. 267 and 268. Additionally, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 265 and 266.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was on leave of absence for the following date in which roll-call votes occurred in the House of Representatives: June 24.

Had I been present, I would have cast my votes as noted for the following roll-call votes

which occurred during my absence. Votes on which I was paired and announced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are noted by an asterisk:

Rollcall No. 264, Duncan amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, Army Corps of Engineers, funding for Corps of Engineers, funding for Kissimmee, FL, "nay."

Rollcall No. 265, Burton amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, 2 percent across-the-board cuts in Army Corps of Engineers projects, "nay."

Rollcall No. 266, Burton amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, 7.2 percent across-the-board cuts in Bureau of Reclamation projects, "nay."

Rollcall No. 267, Coppersmith amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, terminating Department of Energy's advanced liquid metal reactor project, "nay."

Rollcall No. 268, Markey amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, terminating the Department of Energy's SP-100 space reactor program, "nay\*."

Rollcall No. 269, Slattery amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, terminating the SuperCollider, "nay."

Rollcall No. 270, Coppersmith amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, terminating Department of Energy's advanced liquid metal reactor project, "nay."

Rollcall No. 271, Markey amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, terminating the Department of Energy's SP-100 space reactor program, "nay\*."

Rollcall No. 272, Slattery amendment to H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, terminating the SuperCollider, "nay."

Rollcall No. 273, final passage H.R. 2445, Energy and Water Appropriation Act, "aye."

## EXPLANATION OF MISSED VOTES

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal family matter in my district, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes numbered 264 to 273. Had I been here I would have cast the following votes:

Roll No. 264, "no."  
Roll No. 265, "no."  
Roll No. 266, "no."  
Roll No. 267, "aye."  
Roll No. 268, "aye."  
Roll No. 269, "aye."  
Roll No. 270, "aye."  
Roll No. 271, "aye."  
Roll No. 272, "aye."  
Roll No. 273, "aye."

My votes to oppose the space station and the superconducting supercollider—Roll No. 263 and Roll No. 269, respectively—merit further comment. Taxpayers in my district and across the country are demanding that we get Federal spending under control and more wisely decide how to spend their tax dollars. There is no easier way to respond to this demand than to kill the funding for the space station and the superconducting supercollider. Our country cannot afford to continue to spend the billions of dollars demanded by these projects when they drain resources from other desperately needed programs and show little promise of a profitable payoff for the many billions invested.

While there is a need for space exploration, funding for the space station should not continue if its at the expense of other proven



NASA programs, Federal science projects, public housing subsidies, and other critical Government programs. In addition, design modifications aimed at cutting the cost of the space station have reduced the proposed station's capabilities, and several scientific review boards now are questioning the scientific justification for spending such large sums on such limited uses. In light of budget constraints and the significant narrowing of the space station's mission, I cannot support a program that is estimated to cost \$140 billion to build and operate.

According to the GAO, the SSC is already 51 percent over budget for routine, conventional construction activities alone. Government audits of SSC expenditures have shown that tax dollars have been wasted on perks for contractor employees, including \$12,000 Christmas parties at posh hotels, \$25,000 in catered lunches, and \$21,000 a year to buy and water office plants. It's no wonder that a project that was originally estimated to cost \$4.4 billion is now expected to cost \$13 billion. What do we get for all of these billions? Many experts agree that the practical spinoffs from this research will be negligible. In a recent survey, corporate heads of research and development ranked the SSC dead last in importance among major science projects. The plain fact is that Federal money would be better spent on more promising projects in the biomedical, transportation, energy, and other research field.

Quite simply, we need to kill both these programs and the sooner we do it, the sooner our constituents will thank us for prudently managing their money.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 20. An act to provide for the establishment of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

#### REPORT ON H.R. 2518, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1994

Mr. NATCHER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-156) on the bill (H.R. 2518) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services—except the Food and Drug Administration, Indian Health Service, and the Office of Consumer Affairs—and Education—except Indian Education—Action, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Council on Disability, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Occupational Safety

and Health Review Commission, the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, the Physician Payment Review Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, the United States Institute of Peace and the United States Naval Home for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994 and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. NATCHER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-157) on the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1994, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### REPORT ON H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1994

Mr. NATCHER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-158) on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS reserved all points of order on the bill.

□ 1820

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1993

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PROPOSED NEW TAXES HURT THE POOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, despite all the talk about budget reform and the so-called new, improved plan in the Senate, the Clinton budget's bottom line still remains the same: More new taxes.

Our economy cannot absorb these new taxes. The American taxpayer cannot afford these new taxes. No nation has ever taxed its way into prosperity.

Despite the rhetoric in the Senate and in the White House, this harmful gas tax still exists. Some days it is called a transportation tax. Other days it is called a Btu tax.

How many Americans actually know what a Btu really is? Or how many millions of Btus are in a gallon of gas?

We are calling it a Btu tax so that average Americans are confused into thinking this is a tax on someone else. It is not.

The American consumers, senior citizens, small business owners, middle-class workers, and even the urban poor are the people who will pay the tab for the Clinton Btu tax—every time they fill up their car, turn on a light, heat their home, or even cook their dinner.

The Btu tax is equivalent to 8 cents a gallon. That may not sound like much. But it is. The President said that an \$80 billion Btu tax directly affecting the middle class is not much money. We are told that \$450 of new Btu taxes per year per family is not that big a deal to the average American family.

And if this isn't enough, it gets worse. Because the Btu tax is indexed annually for inflation.

The only thing that is guaranteed once this new tax is in place is that it will grow higher and higher each year, no doubt exceeding 10 cents a gallon by next June.

Who gets hurt the most by this new tax? Lower income Americans. Not the rich; the rich can afford the dime-a-gallon increase. But, those who get hurt the most are those who live paycheck to paycheck and our fellow Americans who must live on fixed incomes.

In California—like most of America—a car is not a luxury. It is a necessity. It is the only way people get to work and buy their food. Why are we penalizing working Americans and the poor?

Supporters of the gas tax argue that the Clinton budget has new spending programs and tax credits for lower income Americans. However, the daily

cost of the Btu tax to these citizens far outweighs any so-called benefit they have been promised.

Rather than increase spending to try to offset the negative effects of new taxes, why not just cut wasteful Government spending?

That is what I support—cutting spending. We can attack the deficit through serious and meaningful spending cuts. We simply do not need any new Btu taxes. We know from previous experience that a new gas tax will hurt investment, competitiveness, and economic recovery. Why is President Clinton insisting on repeating this economic mistake? The Btu tax will cost us something that we have too little of in this country—jobs.

Reducing the size of Government and cutting wasteful spending will help the economy and help the private sector to create millions of new, permanent jobs at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Americans to make their voices heard. They should call their Senators and the White House and demand no more taxes. No Btu tax. No transportation tax.

#### A COURSE ON RENEWING AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, on January 25 I outlined the concept of renewing American civilization in a speech on the House floor. I argued that our unique civilization was in trouble and that we could not maintain civilization with 12-year-olds having babies, 15-year-olds killing each other, 17-year-olds dying of AIDS, and 18-year-olds getting diplomas they could not read.

Further, I suggested that the welfare state had failed and that anyone who doubted that should watch any three evenings of any big cities television news. In the length of time it took for 3 Americans to be killed in Somalia 48 Americans had died in the District of Columbia. The level of violence, brutality, and destructive behavior captured by local television news in every big city is proof positive of the failure of the welfare state.

Finally, I asserted that we are in the business of replacing rather than repairing the welfare state. We have to replace it because the basic assumptions of the welfare state about human nature are profoundly wrong. When human beings are reduced from citizens to client and subordinated to bureaucrats who promulgate rules that are antifamily, antiwork, antiproperty, and antioportunity why should we be surprised that antisocial pathologies emerge as a consequence.

The challenge to our generation is to replace the welfare state. Developing a

blue print to replace the welfare state is a daunting intellectual challenge that will take a tremendous team effort. Many people from many backgrounds, many experiences, and many disciplines will have to collaborate to develop a blueprint to replace the welfare state.

One step toward creating a blueprint will be a 4-year dialog: renewing American civilization by replacing the welfare state with an opportunity society.

This dialog will be focused and clarified in four annual sets of lectures on renewing American civilization which will be given on the House floor as special orders and at Kennesaw State College in Kennesaw, GA, as a course with the same title beginning September 18. Then I hope to rewrite the course with a great deal of advice and help and reteach it in 1994, 1995, and 1996 with significant improvements and modifications each time.

There will be 10 topics covered in the lectures and special orders. They are:

Week 1: Introduction to renewing American civilization and the five pillars of renewal.

Week 2: Pillar one: Personal strength as the essential foundation of a free society and a free market.

Week 3: Pillar two: The system of quality and profound knowledge developed by Edwards Deming.

Week 4: Pillar three: Technological progress as the force which has shaped American history and which could dramatically enhance our society by emphasizing the spirit of invention and discovery.

Week 5: Pillar four: Entrepreneurial free enterprise as the essential element of America's past and future economic productivity and success.

Week 6: Pillar five: The lessons of American history which enable us to preserve individual freedom and expand opportunities.

Week 7: Applying the five pillars to maximizing economic growth and job creation.

Week 8: Applying the five pillars to health.

Week 9: Applying the five pillars to saving the inner city.

Week 10: Citizenship for the 21st century: Rethinking the lessons of our Founding Fathers within a global economy and an era of change.

I want to invite all of my colleagues in the House and Senate of both political parties and of all ideological persuasions to participate in helping think through the process of creating a blueprint for replacing the welfare state.

If you and/or your staff have a chance to read my January 25 special order and you agree with the general principles and direction of that speech, I would really appreciate your thoughts, critique, examples, et cetera.

Similarly, if anyone on the committee staffs or anyone who reads the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD has some ideas they would like considered I would very much appreciate their participation. Developing a blueprint for replacing the welfare state is a team undertaking. No one person has the knowledge, the experience or the insights to develop this by themselves. I might mention that Nancy Desmond at Kennesaw State College is the content coordinator for the course and she would also love to hear from anyone with new ideas, good examples, or constructive criticism.

Finally, if you or your staff or constituents would be interested in participating in the course and in developing the dialogue over the next 4 years we would be delighted to work with you. The basic ideas will be outlined both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in material available by satellite from Kennesaw State College at no cost to anyone who has a downlink. They will also be available by videotape, audiotape, and computer. We want to encourage the widest possible participation in thinking through the development of a blueprint for replacing the welfare state.

As our ideas become better developed I will from time to time share them with my colleagues.

□ 1830

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1840

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GORDON] at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2491, VA, HUD, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-159) on the resolution (H. Res. 208) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.



## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) on June 24, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) on June 24, on account of illness in the family.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIM to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Mr. HASTERT, for 60 minutes each day, on June 29 and July 1.

Mr. HORN, for 60 minutes each day, on June 30 and July 12.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. PELOSI to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Mr. LAFALCE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUI, for 60 minutes each day, on June 29 and July 15 and 23.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN in five instances.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. OXLEY in three instances.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

Mr. MCDADE in two instances.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. KLUG.

Mr. MCKEON.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LAFALCE in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. GEJDESON.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.

Mr. STARK in five instances.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. HILLIARD.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. SWETT.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 80. An act to increase the size of the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas by adding the Village Creek corridor unit, the Big Sandy corridor unit, and the Canyonlands unit.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 28, 1993, at noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1522. A bill to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1994 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2010. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2518. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. (Rept. 103-156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2519. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YATES: Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2520. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 208. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

poses (Rept. 103-159). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to the extension of unlisted trading privileges for corporate securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWETT:

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to provide for the dissemination of source reduction and energy efficiency technologies; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2517. A bill to establish certain programs and demonstrations to assist States and communities in efforts to relieve homelessness, assist local community development organizations, and provide affordable rental housing for low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 2518. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 2519. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 2520. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 2521. A bill to direct the President to implement and enforce certain economic sanctions against the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam until such time as the United States Government has received from the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam the fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIA's from the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2522. A bill to authorize appropriations for the design and construction of a hypersonic research airplane as part of the National Aerospace Plane Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CANADY:

H.R. 2523. A bill to amend section 2119 of title 18, United States Code, to authorize imposition of the death penalty if death results from a carjacking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H.R. 2524. A bill to eliminate certain Federal programs in order to significantly re-

duce annual budget deficits; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOPETSKI:

H.R. 2525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phase out the occupational taxes relating to distilled spirits, wine, and beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINGE (for himself, Mr. GRANDY, and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 2526. A bill to provide for the delayed repayment to the Government of advance deficiency payments received by producers who are prevented from planting a crop due to weather or related conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINGE:

H.R. 2527. A bill to forgive the repayment to the Government of advance deficiency payments received by producers who are prevented from planting a crop due to damaging weather or related condition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 2528. A bill to provide equity and fairness to U.S. industries, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

H.R. 2529. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to entities in rural areas that design and implement innovative approaches to improve the availability and quality of health care in such rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to authorize appropriations for programs, functions, and activities of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for fiscal year 1994; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1993 and October 16, 1994, each as World Food Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 219. Joint resolution designating September 17, 1993, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H. Res. 207. Resolution impeaching Robert F. Collins, judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, of bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under Clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. TORRICELLI.  
H.R. 50: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. WATT, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 174: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 214: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 291: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 300: Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 369: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 385: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 455: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 500: Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 535: Mr. CRANE and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 558: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 591: Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 595: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 602: Mr. PENNY, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. THURMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 604: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 606: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 615: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 660: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 690: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 739: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 787: Ms. FOWLER and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 894: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 895: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 957: Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 962: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1114: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1121: Mr. BARLOW.

H.R. 1141: Mr. KIM and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1200: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1205: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1322: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. CANTWELL.

H.R. 1353: Mr. POMBO, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 1419: Mr. MFUME, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1423: Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 1455: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1481: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 1504: Mr. TORKILDSEN and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1552: Mr. JOHNSON of Florida, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 1565: Mr. STUMP, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 1595: Ms. NORTON, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. NATCHER, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1670: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1671: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1709: Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 1753: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1754: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1755: Mr. OWENS and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1883: Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STOKES, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOORHEAD,

Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1898: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1928: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1981: Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. LINDER, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MANN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 2010: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FARR, Mr. HAMBURG, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 2019: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2120: Mr. LEVY and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 2121: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. GLICKMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HOKE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2137: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SABO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 2142: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 2147: Mr. HANSEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. TORRES, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2152: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2157: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 2276: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2319: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. HORN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2355: Mr. PARKER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 2378: Mr. PARKER, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 2394: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2395: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2434: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 2488: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 2498: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. WATT and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. McDADE.

H.J. Res. 149: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.J. Res. 162: Mr. SHARP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr.



KLUG, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ORTON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SHAW, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.J. Res. 173: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.J. Res. 196: Mr. DICKS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. HEFNER.

H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. SWETT.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. GOODLING and, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. DICKS, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 134: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 175: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. ALLARD.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2491

By Ms. BYRNE of Virginia:  
—Page 50, line 20, strike "That" and all that follows through "further," on line 25.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

##### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and modification of real and personal property; purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative air-

craft, necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; not to exceed \$35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase (not to exceed thirty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$7,475,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, including not to exceed \$2,100,000,000 for space station, of which (1) not to exceed \$172,000,000 shall be for space station operations/utilization capability development and (2) not to exceed \$99,000,000 shall be for space station supporting development: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for space station engineering and integration contract activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for space station technical and management information systems contract activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for space station NASA headquarters level one support service contracts.

#### SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in support of space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including operations, production, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property; tracking and data relay satellite services as authorized by law; purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; \$4,882,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction, repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for facility planning and design not otherwise provided, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$545,300,000 to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding

the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated under this heading by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations therefor, the amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended, except that this provision shall not apply to the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design: *Provided further*, That no amount appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used for the lease or construction of a new contractor-funding facility for exclusive use in support of a contract or contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under which the Administration would be required to substantially amortize through payment or reimbursement such contractor investment, unless an appropriations Act specifies the lease or contract pursuant to which such facilities are to be constructed or leased or such facility is otherwise identified in such Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may authorize such facility lease or construction, if he determines, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next appropriations Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities.

#### RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) and travel expenses, \$1,637,500,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appropriation for training, investigations, costs associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$15,391,000.